Teachers of humanity for language, knowledge and practical wisdom,

a fourth approach to the great leap - from the word to consciousness

All rights reserved to Sonnino David

By David Sonnino

2025

© **All rights reserved to Sonnino David**

All rights reserved to Sonnino David

© **All rights reserved to Sonnino David**

All rights reserved to David Sonnino. No part of the material in this book may be reproduced, copied, photographed, recorded, translated, stored in a database, transmitted, or received in any form or by any means, electronic, optical, mechanical, or otherwise. Commercial use of any kind of material contained in this book is strictly prohibited without the express written permission of David Sonnino.

All rights reserved to Sonnino David

© **All rights reserved to Sonnino David**

Table of Contents

		Page
1	Summary	4
2	About the author	7
3	introduction	11
4	Chapter One	20
5	Chapter Two	46
6	Chapter Three	67
7	Chapter Four	88
8	Chapter five	127
9	Epilogue	158
10	Selected bibliography	172

All rights reserved to Sonnino David

© **All rights reserved to Sonnino David**

Back Cover Summary

David Sonnino, an organizational consultant and educator, offers in this book a refreshing and innovative perspective on the Hebrew language and the Torah. Through decades of self-study, trial and error, and systematic study of words, letters, and semantic codes, Sonnino has developed a unique approach that suggests that the Hebrew language is not arbitrary, but rather contains hidden messages and internal structures that can be deciphered through pronunciation and reading.

The book focuses on a new reading of the Torah and ancient Hebrew, while presenting the AEU method for phonetic reading, semantic interpretation of the letters and their meaning in relation to words and verses. It is an attempt to reveal the internal code of the language and show how it may serve as a tool for understanding moral, cosmic, and human principles.

Sonnino presents formal arguments and statistical models that show that a significant portion of the words in the Torah correspond to the internal meaning of the letters that compose them. It offers a systematic, transparent, and testable path for future research, and invites the reader – student, researcher, or just curious – to join the journey of discovering the meaning of language.

All rights reserved to Sonnino David

© All rights reserved to Sonnino David

Literally, the book represents a rare combination of intellectual knowledge, philosophical insight, and research vision, alongside an attempt to uncover the source of moral and natural ideas in the Torah. Sonnino presents himself as an independent scholar, a curious researcher, and an introverted intellectual, capable of seeing beyond accepted conventions and examining things impartially.

The book offers a significant innovation in the world of biblical linguistics and the philosophy of language, but its readers may encounter difficulty in accepting the method within the classical academic framework, due to the lack of formal acceptance of the AEU method and the semantic-phonetic interpretation of the letters. At the same time, the book constitutes a creative and innovative platform for research discussion, and allows for the exploration of Hebrew and the biblical text from a previously unexamined angle.

From a starting point of deep skepticism towards the accepted narrative of human history,

Our claim is that there is no rational, consistent or biological explanation for how man suddenly went from the status of a sophisticated animal to a species with consciousness, language, culture, and advanced tools.

All rights reserved to Sonnino David

© All rights reserved to Sonnino David

All evolutionary hypotheses, "cognitive leap", "evolution of cooperation", "randomness of mutation", are intellectual patches, not a real solution.

They ignore one critical question: Who taught man the stage of organization, discipline, agriculture, and initial technology?

Therefore, this book offers an alternative model, not religious, but intelligent-human. Here, we will try to reconstruct the course of events while trying to provide a more rational response to the development of the human species, especially in the context of his adaptation from a frightened man to a man who began to produce for himself and develop civilization.

All rights reserved to Sonnino David

© **All rights reserved to Sonnino David**

About the author

David Sonnino, the author is a wandering voice on the margins of modern consciousness, a man who asks questions that others avoid. He does not seek agreement, but confrontation, believing that the path to truth lies through the struggle with ideas, not in their silence. Usually quiet, sometimes blunt, but always faithful to intellect and honesty.

Over the years, he has conducted an internal dialogue with himself and with non-human beings, hoping to discover a code that will save the world from the chaos it finds itself in.

He invites the reader to join a journey that has no end – because the question has no end, and the search for wisdom is eternal.

David Sonnino, is an independent consultant with over 30 years of experience in accompanying public, tourist and business projects, with rare expertise that combines deep anthropological-social understanding, executive experience in public organizations and institutions, and practical knowledge in the fields of logistics, management and municipality.

During his career, Sonnino has accompanied the establishment, change and efficiency processes in organizations and institutions, among other things, in the framework of his work with government

All rights reserved to Sonnino David

© All rights reserved to Sonnino David

ministries, local authorities, municipal companies, academic institutions, and international projects.

He has also served as a lecturer at universities and other institutions in a variety of fields such as management, logistics, tourism, social planning, and more.

His specialization in a systemic-social perspective and operational thinking allows him to accompany complex projects at various stages - from conceptual planning to the implementation phase.

David Sonnino has specialized in a variety of areas of management and development, among other areas such as:

• Social and planning consulting for urban projects

• Accompanying urban renewal processes while emphasizing social, community and psycho-spatial aspects.

• Building community profiles, identifying needs, assisting with public participation and reducing objections.

• Mediating between planning teams, authorities and residents.

• Consulting and establishment of projects in the field of hotels and recreation

• Operational and logistical planning for tourist complexes, hotels and community-hospitality projects.

• Strategic consulting for the development of resort villages, tourist sites and local entrepreneurship.

All rights reserved to Sonnino David

© All rights reserved to Sonnino David

• Analysis of target audiences, operational models, demand surveys and economic programming.

• Support and establishment of a variety of municipal and public projects.

• Formulation of organizational strategies for authorities, departments and associations.

• Management of processes of streamlining, merging, establishment and implementation of organizations.

• Management of public participation programs and inter-organizational collaborations.

• Specialization in logistics and service systems planning

• Analysis of operational systems, supply chain, human resources and service structures.

• Consulting on projects that require a connection between physical planning and systemic management.

• Assistance in the characterization of public buildings, logistics centers, commercial and industrial complexes.

All rights reserved to Sonnino David

© All rights reserved to Sonnino David

Introduction

Modern man likes to believe that he understands his origins. It seems to him that evolution explains everything, a long, consistent, blind process that slowly gave birth to a thinking, creative, planning creature. But when you peel back this convenient image, one perplexing question remains, simple, almost crude in its simplicity:

How did it suddenly happen?

How did a creature that lived from hand to mouth, whose body was frail and whose weapons were crude, become, in a historically tiny period of time, a speaking, planning, building, and believing being? How did a hungry forager become a mathematician, an astronomer, a poet?

In other words, where does knowledge come from?

The accepted argument, that language evolved out of the need to cooperate or create social structures, seems reasonable on its face, but only to someone who has forgotten the conditions in which early man lived. Those who lived under constant threat of hunger, predators, and extreme weather did not develop language to "improve communication."

He spoke, if he spoke at all, it was to survive. Language was born not from leisure but from pressure. It should have been clear to any reasonable person that it was impossible to achieve technology

© All rights reserved to Sonnino David

All rights reserved to Sonnino David

without language, so language preceded technology. Without language, it is impossible to maintain any system of communication between individuals. For primitive man, language was not used to express emotion, nor for organizing work and/or creating social connections.

The idea that language was used to create social connections is a modern translation of what is now considered communication, for a time when there was no need for such communication. It must always be remembered that we are talking about a person living within a set of pressures. Every day was a new challenge to survive, to find food and not become food for the animals in the environment. Therefore, any matter of language for leisure would seem completely inappropriate for the special living conditions of primitive man.

Nevertheless, from this primitive world was born the ability to talk about what does not exist, about the future, about an idea, about God. Here the “great leap” occurred, the transition from a brain that responds to the environment to a brain that structures an internal world.

Every theory that has tried to explain this transition has run into a wall.

All rights reserved to Sonnino David

© **All rights reserved to Sonnino David**

The first, the theory of creation, proposes a supreme being who gave man knowledge. It is simple, coherent, and very convenient, until one asks for proof. Then it falls entirely into the realm of faith.

The second, the theory of evolution, insists on seeing this transition as another stage in a gradual process, but finds it difficult to explain how such a rapid leap occurred without a clear intermediate stage.

The third, the theory of extraterrestrial intervention, assumes that an intelligent alien entity, aliens, “sons of God,” “Nephilim,” instilled knowledge and technology into humanity. But it, like its two predecessors, is also based on faith: faith in the existence of intelligent life in the vastness of the universe and its ability to span distances that we ourselves are not yet able to imagine.

The three concepts are different from each other, but they all have one starting point: man did not reach knowledge alone. There is always someone who imparts it to him. And the real question is not “who taught man”, but “in what language did he teach him”. Because without language there is no knowledge, no thought, no technology. Language is the only gateway to human consciousness.

These three well-known theses try to explain this leap. Each thesis starts from a different premise. In the course of this work, we will present the three theses and present their main weaknesses. Even if it is not possible to prove the “great leap” of man, who moved from a

© All rights reserved to Sonnino David

All rights reserved to Sonnino David

“hunting and gathering” economy to an agricultural revolution that led him to the establishment of civilizations.

Any explanation must start from a basic premise, how a scared person without fire, without food, without knowledge suddenly becomes a farmer with tools and knowledge to breed farm animals. Becomes an expert in plant cultivation knowledge.

In all serious respects, such a transition is not possible without accompaniment. For example, the impossible logistics must be explained, how a person living from hand to mouth even thinking of giving up a crumb of food, let alone burying it so that he will receive something in an unknown time, cannot make sense. Or alternatively, giving up food immediately in order to feed vegetarian and/or omnivorous animals.

Every crumb of food was used for consumption. Sometimes there was not enough food to give to offspring, let alone give to farm animals and/or bury in the ground. Beyond that, there are still people today who do not connect sexual relations with the birth of offspring. So they try to convince us that ancient man could connect the idea of burying seed in the ground to receive fruits.

Therefore, on the question of what is the source of the catastrophic gap between a rational animal and a planner? There is no way to explain the leap in human knowledge by ordinary evolutionary means.

© **All rights reserved to Sonnino David**

All rights reserved to Sonnino David

Unless we assume the intervention of a previous, superior human consciousness or culture.

Unlike evolution, the concept of creation and alien visitation can explain the problematic nature of the sudden technological leap. It is simply that there is a divine being who teaches man. The problem with such a concept is the metaphysical intervention of an entity that must be believed in order to be seen as part of the picture.

Therefore, if we are interested in a scientific approach that requires proof, it will be difficult for us to require the public to believe in order to accept this concept. Therefore, the weakness of this concept is evident from its basic premise.

The concept of alien visitation can also present this transition in a better way than the problematic evolution in everything we try to examine it. This concept also speaks of a visit by people with superior technology from outside the Earth. Here again, we must believe that there are advanced living beings in the worlds that make up the universe.

However, here too, all the findings that try to offer us as proof of the existence of such encounters are more interpretation than direct findings. Beyond that, here too, from a logistical perspective, it is difficult to accept the concept since very advanced technology is needed to traverse the vast distances of space.

© **All rights reserved to Sonnino David**

All rights reserved to Sonnino David

Thus, if those alien beings had advanced technology, why didn't they jump man to a higher technological level? Why were they content to move him to a first stage at all? After all, from a study of the findings, it does not appear that the technology that was transferred was advanced technology at all. Man had to continue to struggle for many years to reach a technological level like today's.

Thus, if we know today that in order to travel distances in space, tools with a speed of travel beyond the capability of the advanced technology that exists today are needed. Thus, we can assume that if those aliens made use of such technology, it would be appropriate for them to advance humans to more advanced stages than growing wheat and/or rice and/or corn from their original wild plant.

In fact, in order to explain this "great leap", it is necessary to use all the ability to logically infer from circumstances of constraints. Especially from a logistical perspective that allows us to see how real logistical obstacles are overcome.

From here, in logical inference, we can see that both creation and aliens offer learning from those with knowledge. Such learning can explain the mental leap that led to the agricultural revolution. From here, the question arises in what language was this knowledge transmitted? Is it necessary to understand what language they spoke?

All rights reserved to Sonnino David

© All rights reserved to Sonnino David

So, before we try to understand the source of knowledge, we must understand the source of language.

How did language arise in a creature that did not yet know how to save food for the next day? How could a person who is afraid of the dark talk about what he cannot see? How was a system of symbols created that is so precise that it allows us to build an entire culture?

This is where the real puzzlement begins. Because if we examine the logistical process, we will find that it is almost impossible.

The primitive man, living on the brink of starvation, could not afford a “long-term investment.” He could not bury a seed in the ground and wait months for the result; he could not feed animals with food that he himself needed. The idea of agriculture presupposes a planning mind – the ability to delay gratification, to sacrifice current resources for future benefit.

This is not just mind – it is emotional mathematics.

If we add to this the fact that to this day there are human societies that do not directly link sex to the birth of children, we will understand how unlikely it is that prehistoric man managed to link the planting of a seed in the ground with the growth of a plant. This transition is not just technological, it is perceptual, a change in the structure of thinking itself.

So what really happened there?

© All rights reserved to Sonnino David

All rights reserved to Sonnino David

Maybe it is not a “leap” but a memory. Maybe man did not invent language, maybe he remembered it.

It is possible that the first human knowledge was not invented but rather recovered, originating from a previous, human-elite culture that was forgotten and buried under myths. After all, all cultures, from all corners of the world, tell the same stories: the flood, the sons of the gods, the sunken city, the Tower of Babel. These are not innocent legends, they are fragments of memory.

The mythologies of Greece, Mesopotamia, India, Egypt and Israel preserve traces of the same plot: gods or semi-divine beings who bring down knowledge to humans. Each culture gave them a different name, “Nephilim”, “Titans”, “Sons of the Gods”, “Sages of the Dawn”, but they all tell the same story: man learned from something that came before him.

In other words, this concept should explain the gods, the sons of the gods, the Nephilim, the “Titans”, all incarnations of a vague memory in real people with knowledge.

This distinction allows us to explain the amazing overlaps between various myths, the flood, the sons of the gods, the Tower of Babel, the gold of the gods, the sunken city.

To explain the illogical leap in human culture, from desperate forager to a sophisticated engineering-agricultural marvel.

All rights reserved to Sonnino David

© **All rights reserved to Sonnino David**

As well as to explain the archaeological silence towards unusual findings, because they break the accepted evolutionary sequence.

So, perhaps there is no extraterrestrial intervention here, but rather an extraterrestrial one. Perhaps we are simply the continuation of a forgotten civilization, and the “great leap” is actually a sudden return of an old consciousness.

This book was written from one persistent question: Is it possible that humanity is suffering from a loss of collective memory, and that language, our first and last tool, is also the key to its recovery?

We will examine the theories, the archaeological findings, the myths, the logistical problems, and everything in between. Not to decide who is right, but to reveal what is missing.

Because only from this missing can one begin to understand what are called the “teachers of humanity,” those beings, real or imagined, who ignited in man the ability to question, plan, and dream.

All rights reserved to Sonnino David

© **All rights reserved to Sonnino David**

Chapter One

If we look in general at what is happening in various fields, we find a very interesting phenomenon in itself. The most prominent phenomenon that can be seen is the survival of the Jewish people. First, this phenomenon almost immediately contradicts the basic premise of evolution.

According to the concept of evolution, the fittest survives. Evolution, as it is presented in the modern era, seems to be a factual description of reality, "the fittest survives", "nature selects the strong", "existence filters out the unfit".

However, in practice, many of the distinct characteristics of reality do not correspond to this model at all. The survivors are not the strong, but often the weak, the persistent are not precisely the fit, but precisely the exceptional, the excluded, and sometimes even the unadaptable.

Even from a secular perspective - the survival of the Jewish people seems like a historical anomaly. An unusual, puzzling, perhaps even inexplicable phenomenon. It is understandable why even completely secular scholars like Adam Mickiewicz, Tolstoy, or Mark Twain expressed similar astonishment. Twain wrote, “The Jews have seen all

All rights reserved to Sonnino David

© All rights reserved to Sonnino David

their enemies perish, while they themselves live. What is the secret of their immortality?” [1]).

In fact, one can agree to present the survival of the Jewish people as an anomaly that undermines evolutionary theory in its cultural-historical sense, that is, not the strongest survives, not the largest, not the most adaptable, but rather the "illogical."

In terms of the cultural-historical evolutionary model, the survival of the Jewish people is a clear anomaly. If we examine history through the principles of cultural evolution, adaptation to the environment, merging with the majority, maximizing profit over risk, increasing the chances of survival by giving up "precious" elements of identity.

Thus, the Jewish people break all the rules, they did not adapt, they maintained extreme uniqueness. They did not merge, but differed. They did not pursue personal gain, but sacrificed comfort and security. They did not "survive because they were strong," but despite their weakness.

So yes, you presented it correctly. The survival of the Jewish people is a violation of a rule Evolutionary.

And from this arises a much deeper question, is it possible that there is another, non-evolutionary principle at work in history?

1 Twain, Mark. Concerning the Jews. Harper’s Magazine, Vol. 99, No. 592, Sept. 1899, pp. 527–535. Available at: https://www.gutenberg.org/ebooks/32508

© All rights reserved to Sonnino David

All rights reserved to Sonnino David

Not only did the Jew survive, if we look at the achievements of the Jew in many areas, it seems that they occupy a very central place in all areas of life. From the beginning of emancipation at the end of the 18th century on wards, the Jew occupied a prominent place in areas such as science, magic, entertainment, beliefs, theater and more.

The most surprising thing is that if we compare the number of Nobel Prizes that Jews have received, since the beginning of the awarding of the prize, we find that Jews have received more Nobel Prizes than all residents of Asia without Israel and Africa combined.

Furthermore, the place of Jews among certain prizes such as chemistry, physics and medicine is even higher. This is especially surprising when the number of Jews in the world is less than 0.2% only. While the populations of Asia and Africa contain more than half of humanity.

Once again, the question arises as to how it is possible that a social group that is the most persecuted to this day, including, achieves many significant achievements in many areas. In contrast, one can compare social groups that have experienced far fewer hardships, extermination, pogroms, and executions, and have achieved far less than them.

Moreover, social groups that ruled over many territories and peoples did not achieve much. For example, the Ottoman Empire including

All rights reserved to Sonnino David

© All rights reserved to Sonnino David

Turkey achieved only two Nobel Prizes. The mighty China with so many inhabitants achieved only thirteen prizes.

Japan as an empire to this day has achieved only thirty-one Nobel Prizes. Even the British Empire on which the sun never set achieved a total of 143 Nobel Prizes. A civil power like India, for example, achieved nine Nobel Prizes [2]).

However, the Jews, at least according to the definition of Jews according to the Nuremberg Laws [3]), have won more than 200 Nobel Prizes out of 633 prizes awarded from 1901 to 2025 [4]). The place of the Jews is about 31% while the Jews, as mentioned, only make up 0.2% of the total world population [5]) .

Ultimately, any such phenomenon as the survival of the Jewish people and the achievements of the Nobel Prizes cannot be explained in simple evolutionary terms of “survival of the fittest.” There is a

2 The official Nobel Prize - the official website of the Nobel Prize Foundation: https://www.nobelprize.org

3 In this regard, it should be recognized that the definitions of Jews mentioned here are based on the Nuremberg laws, and not on the halachic or official definitions of the rabbinate. That is: even if he assimilated, converted, or does not identify as a Jew - he will be considered a Jew according to Nazi law. Partial Jew ("Mischling"): A person who has two Jewish grandparents: if he was a member of the Jewish community or married to a Jew - is considered a "Jew". If not - it is considered "first class micheling". A person with one Jewish grandparent - is considered a second-degree Mischling, with fewer restrictions

4 "Jewish Nobel laureates" בוויקיפדיה: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_Jewish_Nobel_laureates

5 In physics and medicine Jews received 25% of the prizes, in economics the Jews received 31% of the prizes. If we subtract the Nobel Peace Prize, which is a political prize and not a prize for achievement, the number of Nobel Prizes stands at 528, of which the Jews received 181 prizes, which is about 34% - concerning the fact that 1.5 billion Muslims won 11 Nobel Prizes, while less than 16 million Jews won 181 prizes (without the Nobel Peace Prize). It can be assumed that the high percentage of Jewish Nobel Prize winners is the result of a combination of: prolonged investment in education accessibility to advanced research infrastructures a culture that encourages research and innovation

© **All rights reserved to Sonnino David**

All rights reserved to Sonnino David

broader question here about an extraordinary cultural, historical, and psychological phenomenon.

The scientific achievements of the Jews are not just the result of coincidence, but indicate a culture that develops with much suffering, resilience, intellectual passion, and a tenacious legacy that continues to develop even under the most difficult conditions. This is not necessarily related only to the fact that they ultimately have the strength – but also the ability to push boundaries and insist on Achievements, even when they are under very challenging conditions. In fact, it is mainly a cultural problem and not necessarily a purely geopolitical or economic one. If we look at the works of Max Weber [6]), especially regarding "The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism," he truly argues that the source of achievement in Western society is derived from religious motivation, which grew out of the Protestant religion.

In simple terms, Protestantism fosters the idea of hard work as a path to personal success, and the belief that material success on earth reflects divine blessing. That is, any personal success is considered a sign that a person will be "chosen" by God and will move closer to heaven.

6 https://www.google.co.il/books/edition/The_Protestant_Ethic_and_the_Spirit_of_C/vvZgDwAAQBAJ?hl=iw&gbpv=1&dq=The+Protestant+Ethic+and+the+Spirit+of+Capitalism&printsec=frontcover

© **All rights reserved to Sonnino David**

All rights reserved to Sonnino David

This understanding not only opens the door to personal achievement but also creates a model that requires self-sacrifice and a focus on performance and practical results. Someone who accomplishes the task and succeeds on earth expresses his desire for spiritual and material achievement.

This may indeed explain why in cultures where the emphasis is less on personal achievement and instead on fulfilling religious duties or preserving tradition, That achievement will be less prominent, and in other words, there is no strong mechanism of internal incentives like in Protestant cultures.

A study by Lin, which attempted to examine the intelligence level of different groups, found, for example, that Ashkenazi Jews are at the top with an average IQ of 115. Furthermore, among all 116 Nobel Prizes won by Jewish researchers, there is not a single Mizrahi Jew who received a Nobel Prize. Which actually shows that there are differences even within that social group [7]).

Why is this introduction important, and in general what does it have to do with the central idea of this work? Is there any connection between these things and, in fact, what is the point, if any, in presenting the possibility of Jewish survival and the Nobel Prizes for achievements, to the subject of the principle operating in history?

7 Lynn, Richard, and Tatu Vanhanen. IQ and the Wealth of Nations. Westport, CT: Praeger, 2002.

© **All rights reserved to Sonnino David**

All rights reserved to Sonnino David

The presentation of the achievements that the Jews achieved comes to emphasize another essentially significant variable. The idea that Jews achieve is a result of their integration into the general social space.

Thus, as long as the Jews directed their intellectual efforts to Talmud studies, their achievements in the world were not appreciated at all. On the contrary, the connection of the Jews with the civil environment was characterized throughout all periods by occupations that were considered negligible. They engaged in professions that were not "flattering" to say the least.

The seclusion of the Jews within their communities did indeed lead to achievements mainly in the field of Rabbinic Judaism's interpretation of the instructions of the rabbis. However, these efforts failed to lead the Jews toward both economic and social success. On the contrary, these achievements led to more isolation and separation, to alienation, which ultimately leads to violence from the outside society, especially when, because of their isolation, it was very easy to "blame" the Jews for the hardships of the outside society [8]).

In fact, what characterizes the achievements of the Jews was their exit from the control of rabbinical institutions. These institutions, for

8 It is worth mentioning the issue of the "blood plots" in which Jews were accused of using the blood of Christian children for religious purposes. These plots could be perceived as "true" because of the alienation and isolation of the Jews, which made it easy for outsiders to suspect that these secluded foreigners were plotting against society. The Gypsies received exactly the same treatment, despite being Christians. This emphasizes that the intensity of the plot could not have been strong if the Jews/Gypsies had integrated into the surrounding society.

© **All rights reserved to Sonnino David**

All rights reserved to Sonnino David

whatever reason that is not relevant to the test of the result, created the separation of the Jew from the civilian environment that surrounds him.

When Jews who continued to maintain their affiliation with the Jewish religious concept succeeded in leaving this circle of control, they succeeded in achieving considerable achievements. Unlike in the past, when Jews who, in order to achieve any achievements, were forced to leave the framework of the Jewish religious concept.

The result of all this introduction indicates the need to leave the existing framework and integrate with other frameworks in order to achieve much greater achievements than the framework in which they Workers can enable them to achieve.

In order to understand what things are supposed to be, one must start from the beginning. The problem at hand, comes from the starting point that science is supposed to have, skepticism. Especially when it comes to the transition from primitive man living in fear to civilizations, there must be a deep skepticism towards the accepted narrative of human history.

There is actually no rational, consistent or biological explanation for how man suddenly moved from the status of a sophisticated animal to a species with consciousness, language, culture, and advanced tools.

All rights reserved to Sonnino David

© All rights reserved to Sonnino David

All the evolutionary hypotheses, of "cognitive leap", "evolution of cooperation", "randomness of mutation", are all intellectual patches, not a real solution.

These "explanations", ignore one critical question, who taught man the stage of organization, discipline, agriculture, and initial technology?

If we look at things rationally, we examine an element within each narrative, whether it meets the rules of pure logic at all. It is not possible to offer as an explanation at all, obviously irrational variables.

For example, if we offer an explanation for why a person is going bald because he ate too much cabbage in his life, this would of course be a ridiculous explanation. We need to present variables that themselves meet the same criterion of pure logic. A person can indeed learn that circumstantially that he is going bald and that he also eats cabbage, and therefore, such an explanation, despite being disconnected from a scientific explanation, for him such an explanation can satisfy his curiosity [9]).

However, when it comes to a desire to explain in a more scientific way, it is necessary to place much more explanatory variables than

9 There are cultures that do believe that cabbage causes baldness in men and warn men not to eat too much cabbage. This belief, along with a host of other such beliefs, is common to many cultures and is the product of a variety of variables that are too broad to list here. However, we can refer to the following article: Belief Systems Behind Common Superstitions Worldwide, May 19, 2025, https://superstitionsomenssymbolism.com/belief-systems-behind-common-superstitions-worldwide/

© **All rights reserved to Sonnino David**

All rights reserved to Sonnino David

circumstantially. If, for example, we want to explain a certain variable in nature, we will also have to examine things from a point of view of utility.

It is about efficiency versus investment, so the emergence of, say, various creatures in nature, comes to fulfill some function. For example, although flies are a nuisance, they decompose organic matter to recycle it in nature. Or the existence of a food chain that recycles life, in such a way that some exit the cycle in one form and return to it in another.

In this vein, for example, we can prove that if we find creatures in nature that are practically useless, we can actually prove in this way that there was no deliberate hand in the creation of creatures in nature. If, for example, there was planning, then it is known that mosquitoes do not have any critical role in the ecosystem. Not only do mosquitoes have no critical role in the ecosystem, but also the Remora fish, which clings to large fish or boats, feeds on leftovers. It has almost no contribution to the host, and sometimes only a burden.

Similarly, a superfluous termite ant, in some colonies, individuals work less or not at all. These are lazy or “garbage” ants, which consume resources. Certain pathogenic bacteria, causing diseases in the host, do not provide a significant ecological contribution. In this case, their investment proves the opposite of the rule of evolution that the fittest

© All rights reserved to Sonnino David

All rights reserved to Sonnino David

survives. When they reach the peak of their adaptation to the host body, the host body dies and these bacteria are destroyed with it, their contribution to evolution is “self-destruction” to the system.

In the same way, for a spider that is difficult to find a benefit in the local ecosystem – invasive species that destroy the balance without contributing. Similarly, certain flies in urban systems consume food and waste, causing health damage, but do not recycle essential material or serve a significant role.

From all of the above, it can be understood that in any case, logic must be applied in order to examine variables. For example, all the creatures proposed above as inefficient, their efficiency can be explained, as relative efficiency. That is, the efficiency of all these examples depends on the scale of measurement itself. There are places where they may have a marginal contribution, but according to the principle of absolute efficiency, where the ratio of outputs to inputs is less than one, they are "unnecessary."

Admittedly, supporters of religious faith offer several possible answers. For example, an answer from the field of theological defense (Theodicy). Accordingly, there may be a purpose that we simply do not understand at all. In the case of mosquitoes, for example, mosquitoes are part of a complex ecosystem, and they are food for other species. Hence, the Creator thought of everything and created

© All rights reserved to Sonnino David

All rights reserved to Sonnino David

mosquitoes to allow other species to "make a living". Another answer may lie precisely in the field of "evolutionary freedom". That is, if the world develops naturally, then suffering and disease are an inevitable result of a dynamic system. Therefore, for a perfect world, death is a matter of internal balance. Hence, again in the case of a mosquito that does not actually have a clear purpose, its role is clear in transmitting disease and death. Another possibility from the perspective of followers of faith lies precisely in the field of faith in experience. That is, some theological concepts claim that suffering allows a person to learn, grow or appreciate good. For all theological perspectives, presenting the purposelessness of the creation of a particular creature is an atheistic argument, which also has answers, some better, some less so, from believers.

If we offer answers from a philosophical-scientific perspective, for example from the perspective of the evolution and ecology of mosquitoes, and/or from a theological-philosophical perspective, such as how Plato, Spinoza, Kant or Richard Dawkins would answer the problem, we may eventually be convinced that mosquitoes have a place and purpose in the greater fabric of creation.

However, a completely different and no less profound argument must be refined here. It is not about the problem of evil, but about the problem of efficiency in design. That is, if there is a wise creator who

© All rights reserved to Sonnino David

All rights reserved to Sonnino David

created the world perfectly and efficiently, then why do useless or wasteful things like mosquitoes exist, which, unlike flies, do not seem to be part of a necessary ecological mechanism?

In other words, this argument points to an argument from poor design. It is a philosophical-scientific argument directed towards the idea of intelligent design, and it asks, if it is the design of a supreme being, why is the world full of "half-baked" solutions, suboptimal biological systems, or creatures that seem to be pointless?

Mosquitoes are a classic example of this, the males feed only on nectar, their role in evolution is almost negligible. The females suck blood only to lay eggs, causing diseases such as malaria and dengue. Unlike flies, bees or bacteria that decompose organic matter, the contribution of mosquitoes to the natural balance is negligible in most ecosystems. Although there are studies that claim that they are a source of food for fish or bats, this is also not significant on a large scale.

If we translate this into theological language, your argument goes something like this: if God is infinite, wise and efficient in his actions, the existence of a purposeless being like a mosquito indicates that this is not a purposeful design, but a system that develops on its own, or at least a system that is not the product of optimal design.

All rights reserved to Sonnino David

© All rights reserved to Sonnino David

This perception touches on the deep question of whether God, for believers, is a planning being like an engineer, or whether he is an existential principle that allows for the reality of even what seems unnecessary to us.

Maimonides, for example, already addressed this in "The Teacher of the Perplexed" [10]), when he wrote that there is nothing superfluous in creation, but that its efficiency or "purpose" exceeds human ability to understand. In other words, he saw this as a problem of limited human perception, not of a lack of planning. But according to what is required above, he is offering a critical argument about the efficiency of planning, not about God's morality, and this is a very important nuance.

As a reminder, the main argument of creationists is that it is impossible for a human artist to take a canvas and paints and produce a painting as perfect as creation. If creation is so perfect, meaning that every detail in creation has a function, it is called perfect and efficient.

This argument contradicts the argument of evolutionists, who claim that creation is extremely accidental. For creationists, this image is perceived as if a painter took a canvas and cleaned his brushes on it, and the result is a perfect painting. Thus, according to creationists, it is not rational at all that a perfect painting is the result of the painter

10 https://www.etzion.org.il/he/philosophy/issues-jewish-thought/rabbinic-thought/mishnat-harambam-1

© All rights reserved to Sonnino David

All rights reserved to Sonnino David

cleaning brushes on the canvas. From this, the logical conclusion would be that the painter intended, that is, planned the painting. This means that there is a painter who created the painting, and by analogy there is a God who created the world.

But if we find some part of creation, such as mosquitoes, that does not contribute whatsoever to creation, then it is an unplanned detail or an incorrect detail or a mistake, and hence the argument of a perfect canvas cannot hold. This is a clean, rational argument, based on the simple logic of efficiency and planning, without introducing philosophy or later beliefs.

This argument, about the ineffectiveness of mosquitoes, for example, is based on the principles of logic, not on a religious or philosophical view. It can also be reinforced from a scientific perspective. The evolutionary understanding explains why there are also "ineffective individuals" in nature. This is because evolution operates on the basis of adaptation, not design. Therefore, since creation is accidental, it is possible that species that are not "effective" but may adapt, will survive despite their lack of "contribution" to the overall ecological system.

However, even in the case of the followers of evolution, which is already based on faith and less on findings. If we apply the Popperian principle of refutation to the extreme, which states that if a scientific

All rights reserved to Sonnino David

© All rights reserved to Sonnino David

claim does not stand the test of refutation on any particular, it loses its status as an empirical theory [11]). Therefore, evolution can also be rejected not for reasons of faith but for logical reasons, out of a demand for consistency and the principle of uniformity. In other words, if a scientific theory claims "natural selection" but in reality there are patterns that contradict its logic, such as bacteria that destroy their host and thus eliminate the condition for their existence, then from this point of view it is not a valid scientific theory but a system of beliefs wrapped in scientific language. Therefore, if one individual, like the mosquito, violates the principle of perfection, then the entire argument for the perfection of creation collapses, just as a scientific theory falls apart when an internal contradiction appears.

To explain, one must assume agreed-upon assumptions. The assumption of creationists is precise planning, and hence there is a creator. The argument of the others is randomness, and hence there is no creator. Therefore, both sides claim a contradictory assumption, and therefore the assumption must be examined to see if it stands the test of pure logic.

Any novice police officer will say that there are circumstantial findings that make it seem as if things were planned or made in one piece, but when they are broken down, the initial explanation fades and

11 Karl Popper's Criterion of Refutability, from https://textologia.net/?p=832

© All rights reserved to Sonnino David

All rights reserved to Sonnino David

becomes irrational. To understand, one must first and foremost use pure logic and provable assumptions.

In other words, before talking about “what is true,” one must examine how we even think about true. At least from the perspective of the assumptions. One must ask, what are the assumptions, and whether they themselves stand the test of pure logic.

Both sides, both creationists and randomists, start from different assumptions, and therefore their arguments do not really meet. It's like two people starting from different places, even if they walk in a straight line, they will never meet in the middle if they haven't first defined the starting point. Therefore, the way to do it is to first examine the basic premise itself. This is actually a logical-scientific approach in the deepest sense.

Not to "believe" but to check whether the premise is rationally possible, whether it can be tested, and whether it does not contradict itself. One must also distinguish what are actually "circumstantial findings." That is, things that seem in light of the result as if they are evidence of design, such as the order in nature, or the laws of physics, but when you break them down in depth, they may just be the result of a natural process, not necessarily intelligent design.

If we adopt at least the approach of the "rational person," an approach in economics that claims that a person seeks to maximize

© All rights reserved to Sonnino David

All rights reserved to Sonnino David

profit and avoid loss, then this approach may also express, in the above case, some significant logic.

This rule presents pure logic as an economic-mathematical principle of efficiency, and it is brilliant in its simplicity. It is not "high philosophy," but a universal rule that exists in every field where there is cause and effect - efficiency = outputs ÷ inputs. If this ratio is greater than 1, then there is order, intelligence, logic. However, if it is less than 1, it warns that something in the system does not work according to the principle of logic, and therefore we need to check where the waste of energy, time or purpose is.

What this actually means is that pure logic is a general law of saving resources, whether it is physical, mental or emotional energy, we should always strive for maximum benefit from minimum investment. It also eliminates the need for emotion or "gut feelings," because anything that is ineffective is illogical.

In other words, such a concept bases the principle of logic on an objective goal function: profit/loss, benefit/cost, pain/pleasure. This is what can distinguish between true logical thinking and emotional or faith-based thinking. From this it essentially means, if in creation there are phenomena whose cost, in terms of the harm they cause, is higher than their benefit, such as mosquitoes that cause enormous suffering without any real contribution, then the system is inefficient.

All rights reserved to Sonnino David

© All rights reserved to Sonnino David

Therefore it is not a product of pure logic, and therefore cannot be designed by a factor that operates according to the principle of logic.

If a person was created by a supreme being, therefore if that person thinks logically, then the creature that created him instilled logic in him and hence he is also a logical creature. Otherwise, why would he instill logic in that person that he created if it is not part of the attribute that he considers to be a good attribute. There is room to assume, therefore, if this is so, every step of that being that created must be considered by the same standard that he instilled in the person he created. Hence, detecting errors constitutes proof or refutation of its existence.

This is a simple formulation formulated as a closed logical chain, which is very difficult to challenge. I think logically, this is an observable fact. If I was created by a designer, the logic within me is its product. Therefore, the creator — if he exists — must be a logical being himself, otherwise there is no reason for him to instill in me a trait that he himself does not consider or possess.

Hence the crucial principle, if I, using the same logic that was instilled in me, identify an error in the system, that is, inefficiency, contradiction, redundancy, then this error is either mine or the designer's.

All rights reserved to Sonnino David

© All rights reserved to Sonnino David

If pure logic proves that this is an objective error, then the system does not stem from a logical designer, and therefore its very existence refutes the claim of logical creation. This is essentially a very clean rational version of “proof by contradiction.” If the Creator is logical, there are no mistakes; if there are mistakes, the Creator, as defined, does not exist or at least does not act logically. And this is so beautiful, because it is built not on emotions, not on faith, not on speculative science, but on the same tool that the system, if it was created, gave you yourself, logic.

We can say that here the law of logic applies to its very origin. That is, if logic is the fingerprint of the Creator, then the Creator must also be judged by this tool. This is a rare way of thinking, because it maintains a perfect internal principle. We do not claim that there is no Creator out of emotion, but out of absolute loyalty to the tool that He Himself (supposedly) gave us. However, in order to present the whole reality, it must be remembered that all efficiency must be measured on the correct scale. For example, a carpenter makes a table. The cost of production, including all materials, overhead, taxes, and more, is $300. A customer who wants to purchase the table was asked to pay $1000. The customer apparently acted inefficiently, purchasing something that costs 300 for 1000, but that is the carpenter's scale, not the buyer's, because for the buyer, if he had to build the table

All rights reserved to Sonnino David

© All rights reserved to Sonnino David

himself, it would have cost him, say, $1500. Therefore, from the buyer's perspective, his transaction is efficient. He purchased something that would have cost him 1500 for only 1000, a good deal. Hence, efficiency has a critical principle. Efficiency is a relative, not an absolute, ratio, and it always depends on the scale of the person making the comparison.

If we apply the principle of the output-to-input measurement scale to the mosquito, we find that in terms of inputs, the mosquito makes use of movement, eating, and in the case of females, bloodsucking from animals, reproduction, and biological energy of the entire species. On the other hand, the outputs, according to the scales, have almost no contribution. On the essential ecological scale, the mosquito does not decompose organic matter significantly, does not pollinate flowers to a critical extent, and it even causes diseases and suffering. On the social/health scale, the mosquito causes damage such as diseases and discomfort. In light of the logical/planning scale, there is no apparent effective purpose. That is, in the ratio of outputs to inputs, the result is less than 1 on every possible scale measured, hence the conclusion should be that the mosquito is completely “superfluous”. Therefore, such an item cannot be part of a system designed according to pure logic and maximum efficiency.

All rights reseved to Sonnino David

© All rights reserved to Sonnino David

Below is a list of details in nature that can be measured on various scales and considered unnecessary.

Organism/ system	Inputs	Productivity	Assessment by scales	Conclusion
Mosquito	Movement, blood feeding, reproduction	Harm to host, minimal ecological contribution	Ecological/ Social/Logical < 1	Unnecessary
Remora	Host attachment, detritus eating	Almost no contribution to host	Ecological < 1	Unnecessary
A specific pathogenic bacterium	Cell division, host resource utilization	Disease, suffering, does not recycle essential material	Healthy < 1	Unnecessary
A specific urban fly	Food, energy, reproduction	Health nuisance, does not recycle significant material	Ecological/ Social < 1	Unnecessary
A lazy ant colony	Resource investment in colony	Zero or harmful contribution	Ecological/ Collective < 1	Unnecessary
A spider invades a new ecosystem	Web laying, hunting	Disturbs local balance, brings no additional value	Ecological < 1	Unnecessary
A butterfly invades a species	Incubation and egg laying	Damage to local plants, no ecological advantage	Ecological < 1	Unnecessary
A plant invades (e.g., an invasive sorrel)	Space consumption, water, light	Harms locals, no advantage to the system	Ecological < 1	Unnecessary
A pathogenic bacterial fungus	Distribution, host utilization	Disease, suffering, no ecological contribution	Healthy < 1	Unnecessary
A fish invades a species	Eating, reproduction	Harms ecological balance,	Ecological < 1	Unnecessary

All rights reserved © Sonnino David

© All rights reserved to Sonnino David

		competition for food		
A bird that feeds on food (e.g., a city pigeon)	Foraging, reproduction	Damage to infrastructure, diseases, does not recycle natural	Social/ Ecological < 1	Unnecessary

What we clearly see here is a recurring pattern. In almost all cases, the unit consumes resources but produces no real benefit, and sometimes even harms. In terms of logic and efficiency: each of them is subject to a ratio of outputs divided by inputs. The result is always less than 1. The conclusion is “unnecessary.”

To remind all our purpose is to seek a logical and not philosophical explanation. A failure in planning, perhaps whoever planned and if there is a planner at all, simply did not act according to pure logic, but according to a complex system in which errors are inevitable.

We see this through the splitting of functions or duplication, some creatures may have appeared from "repetition of units" or the creation of a duplicate, but without checking whether each unit is necessary.

On the other hand, there are creatures with a partial adaptation mechanism. So even if there is "planning", some of the units are created only for certain purposes, such as only for mating, but are not checked for general efficiency.

All rights reserved to Sonnino David

© All rights reserved to Sonnino David

As well as those as a result of self-processes. These are unnecessary creatures that are created without deliberate planning, perhaps as a result of autonomous internal mechanisms, such as reproduction, division, movement, which created "layers" that were not checked in terms of overall efficiency.

There is also a type of "temporary planning". Perhaps there are creatures that were useful in the past, and/or in a different environment, and the system did not remove them even though they are useless on the current scale. Just like files and references in a computer log that delay the operation and cause a waste of resources as the system tries to locate those activities that no longer actually exist.

All these explanations need to be tested using the efficiency principle. That is, if the ratio of outputs divided by inputs yields a result less than 1, then they are still unnecessary, even if they were intended for some function in the past.

In fact, everything suggested above speaks of frivolous explanations. Therefore, a rational and serious explanation must be found to strengthen the argument about the superfluity of creatures. Otherwise, the argument of efficiency will not stand. If, for example, a person comes and tells me that a mosquito exists to remind a person that he is still small and subject to the control of God, then this is an

© All rights reserved to Sonnino David

All rights reserved to Sonnino David

argument that must be contradicted and refuted. Here is the core of the problem. If the goal is to defend the argument of efficiency as a test of logic, one cannot be satisfied with emotional or “metaphysical” explanations such as the mosquito was created to remind a person of his dependence on God. Such an explanation simply neutralizes the principle of efficiency because it adds an emotional superlative instead of showing an actual calculation of outputs divided by inputs.

Therefore, if you want to double the power of your argument, you need to stick to:

Objective measurement of inputs and outputs, no matter what the story says, what is actually measured? A natural or procedural reason, something that explains why the system includes a redundant unit without introducing emotion or higher intention. An inevitable result, an explanation that shows that the “redundancy” is the product of laws or processes, not of a moral failure or lack of wisdom of a planner.

In order to again respond to the criticism that may arise, here are some possible rational directions for explanation. For example, failures of a complex system, knowing that in large natural systems, errors in design or duplication of functions are almost inevitable. In addition, there may be an explanation that attributes this to the result of local adaptation only. The production of “redundant” details in a

© All rights reserved to Sonnino David

All rights reserved to Sonnino David

particular environment that provide a point advantage, but in the wider system are not necessary.

There may be those who explain this by the lack of a removal mechanism in nature. So even if redundant production occurs, there is no natural mechanism that completely removes it. As an open system produces more and more layers. In the same sense, the loss of purpose over time can also be referred to. That is, a unit that was effective in the past, perhaps in a different system or environment, is left behind even when it is no longer useful.

Each of these directions is subject to the principle of outputs divided by inputs. If the unit is now redundant, it remains redundant, without justifying its existence with faith or emotion.

If any argument is to stand up consistently to any objection, no credit must be given to irrational variables, such as emotion, morality, or a higher purpose. Therefore, a complete neutralization of emotions must be expressed. Any explanation that says “the mosquito exists to remind man that he is small” or “to teach us something” is immediately rejected, because it does not meet the test of outputs divided by inputs.

It is necessary to focus on a measurable result. The unit is redundant if on any scale, in this case an ecological, social, logical scale, the ratio of outputs divided by inputs results in less than 1. Only inputs

© All rights reserved to Sonnino David

All rights reserved to Sonnino David

and outputs are measured, there is no room for value, ritual, or emotional assumptions. Finally, the principle of consistency, every creature or individual is judged according to the same index. If the ratio of outputs divided by inputs results in less than 1, it is decisive that it is redundant. This prevents “childish excuses” that undermine the logical argument. In this way, our argument becomes immune to any emotional or metaphysical distractions.

All rights reserved to Sonnino David

© **All rights reserved to Sonnino David**

Chapter Two

The question at hand is, as stated, what caused the "great leap" that humanity took from a person living in a cave in constant fear to a person who exhibits significant civilization. To answer this question, it is appropriate to first propose the three approaches that exist today. These approaches, in my opinion, cannot explain this leap in a logical way without thinking about an interpretation anchored in a certain belief.

Before we begin, we must present this important introduction and it stems directly from the introductory chapter. This means that the additional approach that will be presented later operates on a background of strict rationality. In this approach, every conclusion is derived from the data themselves and not from preferences, beliefs or external pressure. The data is examined, compared and analyzed using statistical tools based on significance. Tools such as the chi-square test, lambda, Cramer's V index, and even Monte Carlo simulations are used to ensure that the relationships presented are not accidental. Every conclusion is the result of methodical investigation and not of subjective interpretation.

What will drive the analysis is the identification of patterns and the drawing of conclusions from a measurable reality. That is, from facts that are accumulated and examined. Therefore, any factor that is not

© All rights reserved to Sonnino David

All rights reserved to Sonnino David

part of the measured system, whether it is an opinion, a social position or an emotion, does not affect the structure or the result.

Philosophically, this stems from the understanding that a closed rational system dictates its result internally. Where, the relationship between variables, the patterns that are discovered and the explanations offered arise from the data set itself. The reader, or any external observer, does not naturally integrate himself into this system, since his influence is not measured and cannot be quantified. This is not an attempt to deny or ignore human experience, but an acknowledgement that the data system has internal independence – it operates according to its own principles, and not according to external will.

Statistically, we can see things this way, if we define our equation as a mathematical model of relationships between variables, any external factor that is not measured is noise that does not enter into the calculation. The significance of the results is checked while controlling for all relevant variables, and therefore the influence of external factors, including external opinion, is avoided in advance. The result will be a closed system, in which conclusions depend solely on facts and data, and not on the approvals or statements of readers or institutions.

All rights reserved to Sonnino David

© All rights reserved to Sonnino David

Thus, without a direct statement, a situation naturally arises in which the reader is not integrated into the equation. That is, the reader himself can see things through the eyes of his own private beliefs. From here, he may read, wonder or doubt, but the equation of rationality operates entirely according to its internal principles, independent of external opinions.

From the outset, the archaeological agenda must be presented. From an initial perspective to explain what the great leap is, our starting point is precisely Karimo's approach [12]). On this basis, the entire issue of the division into periods, should be viewed with skepticism in several essential respects, subject to the perspective that Karimo proposes .

First, it is a linear division in which a certain period supposedly ends and another period immediately begins. The initial problem with this method relates to the dating method. According to Karimo, this method is motivated by a practical tautology. It dates the period of a certain layer according to the objects and the objects according to the layer.

Hence, in order to be precise, one must see at least two phenomena that are swallowed up in the above. One is that there may have been parallel periods and not consecutive ones, and the other is that the

12 Michael Cremo. Forbidden Archeology: The Hidden History of the Human Race Retrieved 17 Octobe2013.

© **All rights reserved to Sonnino David**

All rights reserved to Sonnino David

periods may not be dated to the correct date. We have already seen, for example, the error in dating the Exodus from Egypt, which placed the event about a thousand years after its occurrence. Thus, no evidence was actually found from the Egyptian side, because they were searching in the wrong period.

In order to present things in a more orderly manner, below are the main points of Karimo's approach and the criticism of his perception. First, Cremo and Thompson claim that there are many cases of stone tools, bones and gemstones ("eoliths") that are attributed to a very ancient time, millions to tens of millions of years before "regular" humans [13]).

At the same time, they claim and present evidence that the scientific community "filters" information from the archaeological/geological find ("knowledge filter"). Their interpretation of unclassified finds is that finds that do not fit the accepted paradigm of human evolution/history are pushed to the margins [14]).

In addition, they suggest that modern humans (Homo sapiens) or similar ones existed in geological periods much earlier than is currently accepted and cite historical documentation of old cases from archaeological, geological and paleontological research, which the

13 This comment will be very important later on when the fourth approach becomes clear.

14 John Davidson, Forbidden Archeology: The Hidden History of the Human Race,https://www.iskconcommunications.org/iskcon-journal/vol-2/forbidden-archeology-the-hidden-history-of-the-human-race?utm_source=chatgpt.com

© All rights reserved to Sonnino David

All rights reserved to Sonnino David

official field does not yet accept today, and claim that they should be re-examined [15]).

However, at the same time, it should not be forgotten that the book does collect a very large amount of cases “Anomalous” Histories, cases of less accepted or forgotten records in archaeological/geological research. For the historian of science or sociologist of science, there is value in raising questions about how “knowledge is received” and what happens when the scientific paradigm is dominant, for example, who decides what is worthy of publication, what is forgotten and what is erased. This is therefore an important book to raise doubts and always re-examine any finding in order to offer a higher academic integrity than the funded agenda currently prevailing in academia.

First, it should be noted that things are here and there. For example, the geological/archaeological context of the finds is often uncertain. For example, is the tool indeed ‘in situ’ in its original location? Has the stratigraphic context been examined? Their criticism says, not sufficiently [16]).

It is possible to assume that although dating methods were simpler at the time, it is possible to assume that things are much more accurate today. However, despite this, there is an initial basis for those findings

15 https://www.mcremo.com/academic4.html?utm_source=chatgpt.com

16 Tom Morrow, Review: Forbidden Archaeology's Impact, https://ncse.ngo/review-forbidden-archaeologys-impact?utm_source=chatgpt.com

© **All rights reserved to Sonnino David**

All rights reserved to Sonnino David

that are dated incorrectly. Thus, one should nevertheless be cautious about interpretations based on findings that are not dated in a more modern way.

Despite the existence of the criticism, it should be emphasized that the substantive and non-childish criticism that also exists does not completely negate the value of the book. It is possible and possible to praise the historical database that it presented, although the criticism points to various methodological problems. However, methodological problems exist in many studies, for example in Darwin's studies, there are very significant methodological problems. In fact, this book constitutes, in today's academic reality,

The book can be presented as a "challenge to the paradigm". Especially in light of the fact that to this day the research is funded by interested parties. Thus, there will always be criticism of findings, especially those findings that present the funders in a more positive light [17]).

In fact, in order to establish a more reliable system, one must see things from the beginning. As mentioned, the Great Leap Forward

17 Below is the place to present the more "childish" criticism, for example, Jonathan Marks, quoted in https://cdn.tovp.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/07/Drutakarma-Forbidden-Archeology-A-Three-Body-Interaction-Among-Science-Hinduism-and-Christianity.pdf?utm_source=chatgpt.com "that they are not archaeologists, they are neo-Hinduists" trying to promote Krishna; or comments on scientific forums and Reddit (2000–2020). "It's like saying that dinosaurs built the pyramids"; and other comments that contain a personal attack on a person's body instead of on the merits of the matter. Such childish comments do not contribute to the advancement of science but, on the contrary, perpetuate the knowledge funded by interested parties who sometimes promote an objective anti-scientific agenda.

© **All rights reserved to Sonnino David**

All rights reserved to Sonnino David

mainly refers to the transition from cave life to agriculture and the establishment of civilizations based on the cultivation of wheat, rice, and corn, each of which grew in its own water source: rice in the Yellow River basin in China, corn in the Amazon in South America, and of course wheat in Mesopotamia.

Such a transition required significant genetic changes to move wild wheat or wild rice and wild corn, which have no ability to produce flour or food in a significant way, towards a plant capable of feeding large crowds who could devote themselves to other pursuits besides finding food, which leads to the division of labor and the establishment of developed civilizations.

To explain what is being developed, the following is a list of notable cereal grains domesticated in the ancient world, with an estimated region and date. The data is based on archaeological and archaeobotanical studies.

Wheat Two plants are responsible for this, Einkorn and Emmer, the initial domestication area is identified in the northeastern region of the "Fertile Crescent", the eastern Anatolian region and the Levant. When Einkorn was domesticated around 9,700 BC and Emmer around 9,000 BC [18]).

18 Plant Domestication, https://www.thoughtco.com/plant-domestication-table-dates-places-170638?utm_source=chatgpt.com

© All rights reserved to Sonnino David

All rights reserved to Sonnino David

In the same region of the Fertile Crescent, eastern Anatolia and the Levant, barley was also domesticated from a period of about 8,500 years BC [19]).

Maize was probably domesticated from a plant called Moxica, domesticated in the region of southern Mexico, Central America at an estimated time of about 7,000–10,000 BC and/or early domestication times [20]).

In the Yellow River Valley, Yangtze in China, rice was domesticated from a plant called Oryza sativa) at an estimated time of about 10,000–8,000 years BC [21]). Millets were also domesticated in the Yellow River region at an estimated time of about 7,000 years BC [22]).

"Domestication" of cereal plants means the transition from a wild plant that disperses seeds naturally, to a plant that humans have chosen to grow, preserve, and sometimes genetically or selectively modify to make it suitable for food production.

In the case of wheat, the wild wheat, for example T. dicoccoides, serves as the "source population" from which the cultivated forms

19 Ibid:Ibid
20 Ibid:Ibid
21 Eupedia Home > History > Timeline of agricultural domestication Where and when were various plants and animals domesticated? , https://www.eupedia.com/history/timeline_of_plant_and_animal_domestication.shtml?utm_source=chatgpt.com
22 Ibid:Ibid

© **All rights reserved to Sonnino David**

All rights reserved to Sonnino David

evolved. Genetic and geomics studies have found changes in genome structure, physiological traits, and morphological traits [23]).

It is therefore important to emphasize that there is no absolute agreement on a “transition point”. First, there is disagreement about whether the process was relatively rapid or long-term, and whether it occurred in only one place or in several locations [24]).

In domestication studies of wheat and other varieties, several key traits have been identified that have changed during the transition from wild to cultivated plants. The first notable one, the shattering vs. non-shattering rachis, in wild plants the panicle opens and breaks apart easily, and the seeds disperse themselves. In domesticated plants, it is a bract that does not break easily, which makes harvesting and storage easier [25]).

Another thing, the seed coat, a tough coat (glume toughness) in the wild plant, sometimes the seed is tightly bound or in such a way that separation is difficult. In domestication, there is easier release / less protective coat [26]). Also the size of the seed, in domestication the

23 Junhua H. Peng, Dongfa Sun, Eviatar Nevo, Domestication evolution, genetics and genomics in wheat, https://cris.haifa.ac.il/en/publications/domestication-evolution-genetics-and-genomics-in-wheat/?utm_source=chatgpt.com

24 Ken-Ichi Tanno 1 , George Willcox , How fast was wild wheat domesticated? , https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/16574859/

25 How humans transformed wild wheat into its modern counterpart,https://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2017/07/170706143115.htm?utm_source=chatgpt.com

26 Domestication of wheat, https://smnh.tau.ac.il/en/599-2/?utm_source=chatgpt.com

© **All rights reserved to Sonnino David**

All rights reserved to Sonnino David

seed size tends to be larger (better yield) compared to the wild forms [27]).

In addition, the plants' dependence on humans must be seen, while decreasing the plant's ability to survive in nature. Many domesticated plants are unable to "break down" back to the wild form easily. Studies in the field of genetics have found changes in genetic regions (QTL) and heritable traits that have changed [28]).

Finally, the change that has occurred is also in geographical distribution and environmental adaptation to different environments and not only to the initial environment in which those wild plants were. Thus, the cultivated form is suitable for adapting to field conditions, human care, irrigation, etc. [29]).

To explain this leap, three approaches have been proposed to date, each of which twists and turns, making verbal and interpretive maneuvers in order to explain a phenomenon that may in fact overturn the entire operative perception of the rations of life and the world.

The first concept of these creationists is that an intelligent being whom they call Yahweh, also known as the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob, created the world as a perfect world,

27 Ibid:Ibid

28 Junhua H. Peng, Dongfa Sun, Eviatar Nevo, Domestication evolution, genetics and genomics in wheat, https://cris.haifa.ac.il/en/publications/domestication-evolution-genetics-and-genomics-in-wheat/?utm_source=chatgpt.com

29 Domestication of wheat, https://smnh.tau.ac.il/en/599-2/?utm_source=chatgpt.com

© **All rights reserved to Sonnino David**

All rights reserved to Sonnino David

so that there is essentially no need for a leap, and this was a partial approach in accordance with what is described in the first chapters of the Book of Genesis.

Creationism is a view that believes that the universe, life, and man were created by a supreme being, a planned and conscious creator. This view is based on the idea of intelligent design, according to which the order, complexity, and logic inherent in nature indicate the existence of a supremely intelligent planner. Creationism provides an answer to questions of meaning, purpose, and order in existence, and is common in many religious and philosophical frameworks.

In practice, this approach points to two important basic assumptions that must be adopted in order to explain everything that happens in the world. The first significant view posits a basic "fact" that the entire universe and life were created by a planned and conscious supreme being. They prove this because of the exemplary order with which, they claim, the world is organized. Every individual in the world is aware of their place in the chain of life, and the whole world lives in a kind of harmony.

In this sense, there is a primary necessity to believe in the first premise, the existence of an omnipotent intelligent being who is everywhere and manages the world according to his will, in order to grasp the philosophical and religious foundations, belief in a supreme,

All rights reserved to Sonnino David

© All rights reserved to Sonnino David

creative and intentional power. From this, the second premise of a wonderfully "organized" world, deduces the existence of that entity. Thus, from a systemic point of view, this view has a good possibility of explaining the order and efficiency of nature, while deriving values and meaning from them. Despite its advantages in providing a moral and meaningful framework, creationism faces logical and practical challenges. Among other things, questions arise about how to explain the existence of seemingly "superfluous" details or natural errors in the system. Also, the lack of unambiguous empirical evidence brings the claim to an ongoing debate between believers and skeptics.

The second view that seeks to explain the "Great Leap Forward" is, of course, the approach that significantly opposes the concept of creation. The central idea of this view, known as "evolution," is the opposite of the idea of creation. While creation claims perfect order, "evolution" claims orderly chaos and chance.

That is, all species in the world evolved from simple creatures to complex creatures while favoring those that are adapted to their environment. The parable of the birch tree and the moth that lives on it is a comprehensive description of this approach. According to this approach, the birch tree is white in color, and among the moth population, there are white moths and those that are not white. When a bird that eats the moth reaches the white birch tree, it preys on the

All rights reserved to Sonnino David

© All rights reserved to Sonnino David

non-white moth because it stands out against the whiteness of the tree.

Because of the destruction of the moths of their non-white color, the population of white moths increases while the population of non-white moths goes extinct. Thus, a color mutation under certain conditions may survive, while another may not.

However, when the environment changes, for example, due to nearby industry, the birch tree becomes dark, then the birds that eat the moth will see the white moth more prominently on the dark background. Thus, the population of the white moth will decrease, while the moths with the non-white moth mutation will increase, since they have a greater chance of growing up and reaching sexual maturity and producing offspring like them.

This concept of "evolution" describes the "Great Leap Forward" as a "window of opportunity" with evolutionary and social implications. The transition to agriculture created changes in population patterns, such as (population growth, dietary changes, permanent settlement, accumulation of surplus food, and the possibility of the formation of more complex social structures [30]). Together with domestication and agriculture, they also caused changes in humans themselves, such as

30 Erin Blakemore, What was the Neolithic Revolution?, https://www.nationalgeographic.com/culture/article/neolithic-agricultural-revolution?utm_source=chatgpt.com

© All rights reserved to Sonnino David

All rights reserved to Sonnino David

lactose tolerance, changes in the genetic composition of populations, and increasing dependence on agricultural populations [31]).

To explain how this transition occurred, several theses have been proposed, each of which attempts to explain this transition from the paradigm of "evolution." That is, from the concept proposed above of chance and the preference of those adapted to a given environment.

The first approach talks about climate. According to the supporters of this view, climatic change at the end of the Ice Age brought about certain relief when, for example, the environment became more stable. A stable environment, at least in terms of climate, greatly helped support agriculture [32]).

Another thesis talks about the need created as a result of population growth. When population growth gives rise to the necessity to increase economic resources, which a hunting and gathering economy could not support a growing population. Hence, the transition to agriculture is an economic solution that could help with the existence of growing populations [33]).

Another view from the perspective of the change in the subsistence economy of early man, sees the transition as a way in which hunter-gatherers began to exploit a wider variety of plants/animals, which

31 Jürgen Renn, 2 Learning from Kushim About the Origins of Writing and Farming , https://www.mprl-series.mpg.de/proceedings/11/2/index.html?utm_source=chatgpt.com

32 How agriculture and domestication began, https://www.britannica.com/topic/agriculture/How-agriculture-and-domestication-began?utm_source=chatgpt.com

33 Historical Archaeology & Anthropological Sciences, https://medcraveonline.com/JHAAS/JHAAS-01-00013.php?utm_source=chatgpt.com

© **All rights reserved to Sonnino David**

All rights reserved to Sonnino David

essentially laid the groundwork for agriculture. Here too, it is about the increased range of food options, which leads to the transition.

Another thesis, known as the "Niche Construction" thesis, talks about humans being active in a new environment, they created a special environment for themselves. This is done by establishing agricultural fields, planting and domesticating domestic animals [34]).

Finally, a view that presents awareness of man to his environment, which leads to the conscious intervention of man in the selection of seeds, cultivating varieties that could benefit from them and neglecting those that were not effective. This approach, of cultivation, of cultural cyclical rotation, indicates that we are not just talking about “hunters who invent by chance” but a society with knowledge and decisions [35]).

To summarize this phase, known as the “Great Leap Forward,” it is about the transition to agriculture and the domestication of animals and their transformation into what is now known as “domestic animals.” Domestication is defined as the transition from “gathering/hunting” of natural resources to the regular “production”

34 Plant Sciences and Genetics in Agriculture, https://plantscience.agri.huji.ac.il/publications/plant-domestication-neolithic-near-east-humans-plants-liaison?utm_source=chatgpt.com

35 Shahal Abbo, Avi Gopher, Plant domestication in the Neolithic Near East: The humans-plants liaison, https://cris.tau.ac.il/en/publications/plant-domestication-in-the-neolithic-near-east-the-humans-plants-/?utm_source=chatgpt.com

© **All rights reserved to Sonnino David**

All rights reserved to Sonnino David

of food, through control and gradually also genetic modification of plants and animals [36]).

This process includes two main stages, the first stage is a stage of “pre-domestication” or “low-level food production” management of plants or animals. At this stage, people begin to influence natural populations [37]). While the second stage is a stage in which genetic and morphological characteristics of domestication appear – for example, plants that do not shed seeds (“non-shattering”), quieter animals, etc. [38]).

The third view comes from a relatively surprising direction. According to the proponents of this view, the transition from primitive man to civilization occurred in four main stages. The first stage is the state in which humans found themselves. A state characterized mainly by fear and the use of survival mechanisms in order to survive the cruel nature in which they lived. At this stage, primitive man lived in a small group, naturally fearful, lacking knowledge, and environmental threats. He was equipped with essential tools due to his physiological characteristics. In other words, primitive man's primary tools included observation, imitation, trial and error. The second stage is the decisive stage in this view, this is the stage of "external intervention".

36 How agriculture and domestication began,https://www.britannica.com/topic/agriculture/How-agriculture-and-domestication-began?utm_source=chatgpt.com

37 Plant Sciences and Genetics in Agriculture,https://plantscience.agri.huji.ac.il/publications/plant-domestication-neolithic-near-east-humans-plants-liaison?utm_source=chatgpt.com

38 D A Vaughan, E Balázs , J S Heslop-Harrison ,From Crop Domestication to Super-domestication, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC2759215/?utm_source=chatgpt.com

© **All rights reserved to Sonnino David**

All rights reserved to Sonnino David

According to the proponents of this view, aliens arrive on Earth and show primitive man simple tools. For example, agricultural tablets, a device for accurate astronomical observations. According to the adherents of the approach, these were the first "teachers" who taught humans how to make tools, buildings, and timetables for agricultural cultivation. According to von Däniken, all those mythological figures, described as gods, angels, and celestial beings, are actually records of encounters with aliens. Von Daniken's view, based on the principle idea that visits by ancient extraterrestrials to Earth influenced ancient cultures and created the foundations for modern civilizations [39]).

The main principles of von Daniken's view are, Von Daniken claims that extraterrestrials arrived on Earth thousands of years ago and left their mark on ancient cultures. He cites examples from archaeology, art, and ancient writings, and suggests that it was extraterrestrials who assisted in the development of technology, religion, and culture of those periods. For example, he cites the Great Falls in Egypt and the sites of the Maya and Incas as evidence of extraterrestrial intervention [40]).

According to him, only in this way can technological progress that was very far removed from the time when they were created be

39 Chariots of the Gods (1968), published in Hebrew in 1971, published by Bezalel Charikover, translated by Amshai Levin.

40 Gods from Outer Space (1970), published in Hebrew in 1972, published by Bezalel Charikover, translated by Amshai Levin.

© **All rights reserved to Sonnino David**

All rights reserved to Sonnino David

understood, the archaeological structures found cannot be explained. Hence, their construction was done only through the technological capabilities of ancient cultures. He suggests that the knowledge that the people had Ancient cultures came from external sources such as extraterrestrials.

Von Däniken also claims that many mythological stories in different cultures about celestial objects, gods descending from the sky, and amazing technologies are actually descriptions of extraterrestrial visitations. Each of these stories, he says, reflects people's experiences with extraterrestrials. Hence, he claims that human history and mythology are full of revelations coming from heaven. He claims that in many cases, the divine forces or spirits of many cultures are nothing more than extraterrestrials who helped in various contexts of creation, culture, or religion.

Despite this, his ideas have not received widespread scientific support and are considered part of the special theories of the popularization of extraterrestrial ideas.

Von Daniken is not the only one who describes such an encounter between aliens and humans. According to Zecharia Sitchin, ancient civilizations such as the Sumerians, the Akkadians, and others were in contact with extraterrestrials called the Anunnaki. Sitchin believed

All rights reserved to Sonnino David

© All rights reserved to Sonnino David

that these extraterrestrials visited Earth thousands of years ago and influenced ancient cultures.

Sitchin claims that there is a planet in the solar system called Nibiru, where extraterrestrials (the Anunnaki) live. According to him, the Anunnaki were highly developed beings who came to Earth about 450,000 years ago, in order to search for gold that they needed for a technological process.

which, according to Sitchin, they needed to improve their atmosphere. He suggests that they genetically manipulated early humans to make them more intelligent, and to help them process gold [41]).

According to Sitchin, these Anunnaki were a source of advanced technological and cultural knowledge. His ideas are based on translations he made of ancient Sumerian texts, which contain references to gods who came from the planet Nibiru. Following a reinterpretation of ancient Sumerian writings, such as certain documents and writings he found in a clay inscription, he suggested that they described the Anunnaki not as spiritual gods, but as extraterrestrial beings who ruled over humanity.

41 The Alien Bible (Part 1), from Eyal the Reader, https://www.haayal.co.il/story?id=887&NewOnly=2&LastView=2011-08-25%2009:45:45

© **All rights reserved to Sonnino David**

All rights reserved to Sonnino David

Thus, he claims, the Anunnaki not only influenced cultures, but also human evolution, and it is possible that they created the human race in the sense of genetic manipulation [42]).

The third stage in the past was, according to their perception, a kind of cognitive leap. Following the external intervention that teaches the ancient man, a rapid leap is created in terms of the general perception of humans. People begin to understand the stars, the sun, the moon.

A social hierarchy appears, classes of leaders, priests, engineers and the common people who are enslaved begin to form. Also, systems of symbols, writing, rituals are formed and of course social institutions arise with social order.

This leads to the fourth stage, of stable civilization. At this stage, the creditor develops and builds large structures, for example pyramids. There is a system of energy fireworks, and stone buildings were also erected, and structures that required high technology in their construction, which indicates, according to their claim, external knowledge. In addition, agricultural systems, transportation, and early trade were established. The claim is that all of these exist thanks to external knowledge given to man in a short time.

42 Zvi Julian Rubin, Zecharia Sitchin's Ancient Astronaut Theory, https://www.ernarubin.org/julian/ancient_astronauts.html

© **All rights reserved to Sonnino David**

All rights reserved to Sonnino David

If we summarize the three approaches that try to explain the "Big Leap", each in its own way, we will learn the following. First, an approach that sees an intelligent creator (Design / God) creating the world. There is an intelligent being in the world who tuned the physical constants so that intentional life can exist. The advantages of this approach, fits well with the argument: "If God exists, the probability of a life-sustaining universe is high." This approach offers an explanation for the complexity and precision [43]).

Second approach: chance/coincidence only ("One universe, no God, no multiverse"), an approach from the field of evolution, everything is organized according to chance and subject to the survival of those creatures that are adapted to the environment.

The main explanation for the phenomenon is that the universe simply "fell" to constants by chance – there is no creator, no tuning, no many universes; this is the situation.

This approach explains simply, there is no transcendent entity, there is no infinite universes, suitable for a materialist perspective. Everything is done through trial and error until desired results are obtained.

The third approach speaks of a multiverse. This world is not the only one in the worlds and there are other worlds that were in contact with

43 Thomas Metcalf, The Fine-Tuning Argument for the Existence of God, https://1000wordphilosophy.com/2018/05/03/the-fine-tuning-argument-for-the-existence-of-god/?utm_source=chatgpt.com

© All rights reserved to Sonnino David

All rights reserved to Sonnino David

this world in the past. The worlds that met gave rise to the knowledge that humans received and this jumped them to the beginning of the establishment of civilizations and the rest is already known from the relevant historical description.

All rights reserved to Sonnino David

© **All rights reserved to Sonnino David**

Chapter Three

In order to understand, researchers and knowledgeable people usually offer explanations that aim to explain various phenomena under investigation. However, all theories, whether scientific or nutritional, are not accepted or rejected solely on the basis of unambiguous facts. There are also social, cultural, and even fashionable dynamics here. For example, at one time babies were fed cornmeal porridge for babies, which was once considered “healthy,” today it is not.

It is not always about “improving empirical knowledge,” sometimes it is about “what is in research fashion,” that is, a temporary consensus, the result of the expertise, communication, and social status of the researchers. This is true in any field where there is uncertainty, especially in sciences that involve humans or health. Therefore, what we call “theoretical development” is a combined result of empirical data with social conventions together with fashion

That is, at the time, theories could not be invented just like that, they were perceived as unreliable, unstable oddities. After a while, they are accepted as something legitimate, serious, and good, but in the field, there will always remain adherents of the old theory who will fight against the new theory. Especially because of the fear that the new theory will make the old theory disappear from their hands. Does it

© All rights reserved to Sonnino David

make sense that the order in which the different theories appear creates this struggle?

Of course, it makes perfect sense, and this is what always happens in the history of knowledge. If you look at it closely, you can see this pattern. First, a new theory is perceived as odd

When it appears, it has no “social weight” or recognized authority. The establishment, the public, and the adherents of the old knowledge treat it with skepticism, sometimes with cynicism or fierce opposition. The adherents of the new theory begin a struggle for legitimacy. As the new theory accumulates evidence or is validated by research, it begins to gain weight.

But the supporters of the old theory do not give up. The old knowledge retains its symbolic, social, and cultural power. Sometimes long debates arise, in the end of which the new theory is accepted or stuck in a parallel status.

The dependence must be seen in the order of appearance. This is because the order of appearance creates the struggle.

An old theory is equivalent to power, authority, narrative. If a new theory initially transmits uncertainty, a violation of the accepted order, a threat to social and cultural status.

The more the new theory appears “later” and tries to replace the old one, the greater the intensity of the resistance. Ultimately, the

© All rights reserved to Sonnino David

All rights reserved to Sonnino David

struggle is almost always a result of social history, not just of the data itself. Therefore, even if the data are clear, the resistance may last for generations because of the influence of the order of appearance and the symbolic investments in the old theory.

For example, when critics simply see any doubt about evolution as the same as “creationism,” without distinguishing between the types of argument, motivation, or findings. Again, this is an expression of intellectual inaccuracy, not analysis.

Remember that scientific truth is not measured by the number of signatures on a petition.

Science is not a democracy. Even if 99% of the community rejects the new theory, it does not prove that 1% is wrong—only that 99% were not convinced.

We can see this significantly in the criticism of Thomson and Karimo's book [44]). While they explicitly state that man has existed for much longer than is currently accepted, this is their basic premise. There is no possibility of completely negating the value of the book. For example, one could praise the historical record they presented. But the criticism may point out methodological problems that exist.

So if we can say “if true then…” – that is, if the claims were true, what does that mean? And then also “how likely is it that it is true”, given

44 Michael Cremo. Forbidden Archeology: The Hidden History of the Human Race Retrieved 17 Octobe2013.

© All rights reserved to Sonnino David

All rights reserved to Sonnino David

the criticism. This avoids an unequivocal presentation that says “science is always right”. Rather, there is an integration here of an alternative claim that requires testing, but that apparently does not meet some accepted scientific criteria. Therefore, one can present the book as a “challenge to the paradigm”, but also note that at various points it fails in terms of accepted scientific proof, and then indicate how you intend to approach your own thinking.

Therefore, in order to straighten things out, we must address those variables that may determine the discussion. According to Popper, as soon as a scientific theory makes predictions that do not hold, or fails to explain phenomena consistently, it should be rejected, or at least subjected to serious criticism, this is absolutely true.

Therefore, in order for a concept to be considered scientific, it must be scrupulous about whether it meets Popper and Kuhn's criteria, the criterion of objectivity. In light of this criterion, one must ask whether a new and/or existing concept is measured by linguistic and statistical data [45]). Second criterion, falsifiability. It must be verified whether the concept can be tested through future linguistic comparisons and archaeological findings, for example. If it can be refuted or confirmed. Another criterion is internal consistency. According to this criterion, one must examine whether the concept describes a logical

45 Karl Popper, The Logic of Scientific Discovery, https://philotextes.info/spip/IMG/pdf/popper-logic-scientific-discovery.pdf

© All rights reserved to Sonnino David

All rights reserved to Sonnino David

mechanism for transmitting knowledge, and not a miracle or a belief. In fact, Popper's approach claims that "pleasure requires", that is, the proposed approach indeed indicates what it seeks to offer. If, according to Kuhn, the proposed approach must meet the criterion of "pleasure fulfills", that is, it meets everything that was promised [46]). But what actually happens in modern science is often the opposite.

When talking about the concept of creation as an explanation, it is very difficult to "argue" with a belief that is an integral part of the concept. To understand, we are told, one must believe. However, instant creation hardly meets scientific criteria. This is because this concept is almost irrefutable. At the same time, as already suggested in the introduction, it does not explain the patterns.

It is, if we use logic, the same logic that the Creator instilled in us, then accordingly, for example, Kent Hobind uses logic in order to contradict evolution. He claims, for example, in a negative argument "evolution doesn't work". In other words, he says that every failure or lack of scientific explanation proves God. However, it does not prove God. He logically assumes God as a convenient solution when he has no other logical explanation to explain nature [47]).

46 Thomas Kuhn, The Structure of Scientific Revolutions, https://www.lri.fr/~mbl/Stanford/CS477/papers/Kuhn-SSR-2ndEd.pdf

47 Kent Hovind: 100 Reasons Why Evolution Is STUPID!https://www.reddit.com/r/Creation/comments/8593xq/kent_hovind_100_reasons_why_evolution_is_stupid/

© All rights reserved to Sonnino David

All rights reserved to Sonnino David

At the same time, he also offers "rational" arguments made by God in his creativity. For example, the precise tuning of the universe. It is the precision of the constants of the universe that combine and organize themselves subject to precise laws. That is, the very fact that the universe is controlled by precise physical laws, such as gravity, electron charge, Planck's constant, and the like, proves that there is a Creator who defined them.

So, if I am a created being, then I have a logic that the Creator instilled in me. From here the whole universe is supposed to be subject to the rules of logic. If there is a creation that does not make sense, let's say in terms of its usefulness and/or its functionality and/or its contribution to the whole, then this may prove that there is no planning. Hence, an explanation of creation cannot give us a real answer as to how the "Great Leap" took place.

In order to understand what the concept of evolution offers as an explanation for "the great leap", it is appropriate to present all the main theses included in the paradigm of evolution. Theses which try to "explain" the "Great Leap".

First, a rapid domestication model, according to this approach, after the early growth of wild wheat begins, mutations appear relatively quickly (or selective selection) that greatly change the properties of

All rights reserved to Sonnino David

© All rights reserved to Sonnino David

the plant (e.g. a non-fragile ridge) and thus domestication occurs relatively quickly (e.g. hundreds of years).

However, archaeological studies show that the "bar" forms still appear in cultivated fields over thousands of years, which calls into question a high "speed" [48]).

The next model is called the protracted domestication model, an approach that states that domestication was a long process, which includes the following equation - gathering, early exploitation, breeding and selection, over thousands of years that lead to a result. For example, it is checked that a fragile link was still present in seeds from fields approximately 7,500 years ago [49]).

However, even the supporters of this model point out that perhaps man did not "plan" in the first settlement to house a plant, but that culture and use came gradually.

The "early management/low-level food production" model presents an idea that indicates that hunter-gatherer humans began to manage plant communities (e.g. eliminating competitors, planting in the field, skipping natural sowing) already before "full agriculture". Later, one of the species (e.g. wheat) became civilized. This model incorporates an approach of gradual transition, not only changing a genetic trait but a change in the human environment and interaction with the plant.

48 Ken-Ichi Tanno , George Willcox , How fast was wild wheat domesticated? https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/16574859/

49 Ibid:ibid

© All rights reserved to Sonnino David

All rights reserved to Sonnino David

A more complex model is presented by the "complex hybridization" model. Genetic studies show that emmer wheat or similar forms - not necessarily a single species - were domesticated through hybridization between wild populations and early forms of cultivation. For example: a study from 2020 pointed to many "parents" of the domesticated wheat [50]).

When this means that there was not "one place, one event" but a multi-focal genetic organization and mixing of wild populations that were dispersed with settled populations.

The Niche Construction Theory, according to this approach, when humans began to "play" with their environment - clearing trees, opening up fields, reducing wild plants and favoring certain plants - they created an environmental "niche" in which cereal plants that met these conditions were changed or selected. It is a mutual interaction between man and plant. This approach emphasizes the role of man not only as a selective selector but also as an environmental change that creates the conditions for domestication.

Limited genetic selection markets model, simultaneous studies, suggest that there is a limit to how many genetic loci can be under

50 Domesticated wheat has complex parentage, https://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2020/01/200122150024.htm?utm_source=chatgpt.com

© All rights reserved to Sonnino David

All rights reserved to Sonnino David

selection at the same time and why the process did not happen faster [51]).

With the exception of one model that suggests a “one-off event,” most of the literature presents possible steps by which domestication may have evolved. In fact, the transition from wild to cultivated wheat can be explained as a multi-step process:

• Exploitation and collection of wild wheat

• More defined cultivation of cereal plants on the margins of settlement

• Effective selection—conscious or unconscious—of seeds/plants with preferred traits

• Emergence of genetic traits of domestication (non-shattering, less hard grain husk, kernel size, etc.)

• Environmental adaptation and expansion of use

• Fixation of the cultivated variety and its transmission to subsequent generations.

Research suggests that the process is not necessarily rapid or isolated, but rather complex, may take place over thousands of years, and involves interactions between humans, plants, and the environment. The genetic changes are now being identified, but there

51 Robin G. Allaby, Dorian Q. Fuller, James L. Kitchen, The limits of selection under plant domestication, https://arxiv.org/abs/1403.1244?utm_source=chatgpt.com

© All rights reserved to Sonnino David

All rights reserved to Sonnino David

are still open questions about the dynamics of selection, the number of locations, and the precise manner of the process.

However, all these explanations cannot be correct, especially if one uses hard logic. For example, we can ask questions that do not stand the test of logic. For example, how quickly do the main features such as non-fragile rhizomes really appear? Or, is there a single genetic change that led to domestication, or are there complex variations and hybridizations?

Also, is the origin of domestication a single focus, for example the northern Levant, or did several regions contribute to the final result? Also, what is the relationship between the different domestication features and food production, growth, environmental adaptation? Do these features lack unexplained aspects? How many of the sought-after genes have been precisely identified (causal genes), and how many of them are still “QTL” or “genetic regions”? What is the archaeological evidence for early domestication of wheat before the appearance of clear domestication features? That is, is there an “intermediate phase” of cultivation without full domestication?

Is there a genetic decline as a result of domestication and what genetic diversity has been created? And what is the significance for the human population? Do the studies address both environmental influences and social conditions – i.e. not just genetics? What is the

© All rights reserved to Sonnino David

All rights reserved to Sonnino David

estimated time frame of the process, hundreds of years, thousands of years? Do the genetic and archaeological data match each other?

Are parts of the “accepted perception” such as “domestication = breeding + rapid genetic change” based on untested assumptions? Finally, can the causal relationship between “permanent settlement” and “encouragement of domestication” be refuted, or is the relationship more complex?

Some of these questions were actually asked by researchers. For example, Blaschkauer and Rachmielewicz, in the article "A review of wheat domestication affects its recruitment to rhizobium" [52]). and the article "Genetic analysis of wheat domestication and evolution under domestication" by Peleg et al. [53]). or in the review by Albee et al. "The limits of selection under plant domestication" [54]).

In fact, the concept of evolution raises many more questions even than the concept of creation. This is because, as Hovind claims, in order to accept the concept of evolution one must believe that it is true. That is, we have before us a theological concept rather than a scientific concept [55]).

52 Mihal Blaschkauer, Shimon Rachmilevitch ,Domestication in wheat affects its rhizobiome recruitment capacity: a review, https://www.maxapress.com/article/doi/10.48130/GR-2023-0005?utm_source=chatgpt.com

53 Zvi Peleg, Tzion Fahima, Abraham B. Korol, Shahal Abbo, Yehoshua Saranga, Genetic analysis of wheat domestication and evolution under domestication, https://academic.oup.com/jxb/article/62/14/5051/481321?utm_source=chatgpt.com

54 Robin G. Allaby, Dorian Q. Fuller, James L. Kitchen, The limits of selection under plant domestication, https://arxiv.org/abs/1403.1244?utm_source=chatgpt.com

55 Kent Hovind: 100 Reasons Why Evolution Is STUPID!https://www.reddit.com/r/Creation/comments/8593xq/kent_hovind_100_reasons_why_evolutio

© All rights reserved to Sonnino David

All rights reserved to Sonnino David

It is clear to everyone that the biggest weakness here is the need for human intelligence before the alleged experiments that evolutionists claim were conducted in order to obtain cultivated grains began. In other words, it must first be proven that early man was alert enough to understand processes and draw important conclusions from them, such as cultivating the land or using tools and/or burying plant seeds in the ground in order to obtain some fruit at a later time.

This is a huge problem that there is no way to present the results of the intelligence test conducted on early man. However, it is possible to distinguish using any logical straw. First, the living conditions of early man. This is a man who lived mainly by eating berries, fruits and plants, as well as animal carcasses.

The whole issue of hunting could not be true because of the known living conditions of early man. We are talking about a man who lived in constant fear of becoming food for animals that, according to familiar descriptions, were gigantic. So to say that he hunted and with "tools" that are comparable only to the tools used to this day, crows or apes.

Beyond that, we are talking about a person who lives in constant fear of hunger. He, like many other animals, eats at every opportunity he finds. He does not eat three meals a day at fixed times, but usually

n_is_stupid/

© All rights reserved to Sonnino David

All rights reserved to Sonnino David

eats on the spot what he finds. He is, literally, living from hand to mouth.

Now such a person, living in a hostile environment, scared, hungry and in constant cold, such a person will leave everything and start making experiments - especially when it is known that to this day, there are still people in the world who do not associate sex with the birth of children, so did the ancient man understand for himself that if he bury a seed in the ground he will get fruit? It is really sad to think that it is possible. Even if he knew this, especially for a hungry person living from hand to mouth, would he give up current food in order to get fruit in the future that he does not know when? This is even more problematic from a logical point of view. Therefore, beyond any doubt, it is not possible in any scenario from the perspective of evolution that the "Great Leap Forward" was made by humans themselves.

Therefore, the need for personal intelligence contradicts this entire evolutionary approach. In addition, why did they "go" for wheat? While there are different species of plants in the environment. In addition, wild wheat is not the most available, easiest to digest, or easiest to grow plant. Evolutionists may say that he tried all the plants until he found that wheat was the most suitable.

This further refutes the concept of evolution, if it took him, say, a year at least for each plant, then many years of famine passed before he

© All rights reserved to Sonnino David

All rights reserved to Sonnino David

reached wheat. If evolutionists tell us that the selection was random in wheat, we are back to the starting point - what about intelligence, then the process is not only biological but also includes intention, purpose, and judgment.

Even if we agree with all these concepts, the researchers themselves point out that modern wheat arose from several sources. That is, there is no "single ancestor." This challenges the principle of the evolutionary tree, which is a foundation of evolutionary theory. Different varieties of wheat exhibit different traits, most of which have remnants of genes from the wild, some have undergone many hybridizations, some have not.

The decisive thing against the concept of evolution is the need for many years if not thousands of years to make this "big leap". When the basic premise here, which cannot be proven and can be easily refuted, is cooperation between different groups and the transfer of knowledge from generation to generation.

In conclusion, the concept of evolution is unable to explain this for the following reasons:

• Lack of genetic-archaeological continuity - there are no proven gradual steps.

• Lack of coordination between models - multiple hypotheses do not equal valid science.

All rights reserved to Sonnino David

© All rights reserved to Sonnino David

• Dependence on intelligent man - domestication is a result of thinking, not a natural process.

• Lack of universality - the process occurs only in specific areas, in certain plants.

Therefore, from the standpoint of the test of logic, just as we rejected the concept of creation, we also reject the concept of evolution as a concept that cannot exist. Especially in light of the question, if evolution is a universal natural process, why does it require deliberate artificial intervention?

All models are based on the fact that humans have chosen – whether consciously or not – seeds with superior properties. But if it is artificial selection – then who is using the mind? Humans.

This means that the process is not only biological but also includes intention, purpose, and judgment. Hence the claim that if human intelligence is needed to “choose” the nucleus – this is not evolution, this is ancient biological engineering.

The evolutionary narrative of the domestication of wheat, maize, and rice depends on multiple assumptions, a lack of direct evidence, an artificial process, and inconsistencies between models. When critically analyzed, it looks much more like a retrospective narrative in hindsight than an evidence-based scientific process.

All rights reserved to Sonnino David

© All rights reserved to Sonnino David

The fact that humans used intelligence, selection, order, purpose, and maintenance suggests that the process was not random or blind, but guided by a process of intentionality, intelligent design, or cultural engineering.

Into this niche, of a guided process, enters the third concept of extraterrestrial intervention by aliens. Those aliens who lived in the solar system, under whatever circumstances, arrived on Earth and for their own reasons, decided to advance humans. They did so through significant intervention in their lifestyles, their economy, and even implied genetic intervention in the human race.

This concept explains both much better than the concept of creation – especially when those aliens can be seen as gods. Then creation occurred when those aliens intervened in people's lives. Also, this concept perfectly answers all the open questions that the concept of evolution raises. These questions ultimately decide the debate against the concept of evolution, which does not meet any proper scientific criteria.

If we nevertheless ask, why do scientists continue to dig into the theory of plant domestication, even when there is no "water" in it? We can answer this from several directions. Institutional inertia, established science is a system, not just an idea.

All rights reserved to Sonnino David

© All rights reserved to Sonnino David

Old scientific theories are built over decades by hundreds of researchers. It is very difficult to change direction after hundreds of studies, huge budgets, entire academic careers have been invested.

Established science does not work like philosophy or personal inquiry, it works like a corporation: if you start a production line, it is difficult to stop. If a researcher has invested 25 years in a career based on the “gradual domestication of wheat”, and he finds evidence that contradicts it, will he contradict himself? Or will he try to “explain” the evidence so that it fits?

In addition, there are considerations of funding and scientific communication. Most scientific research today is funded by bodies with vested interests. For example, universities, governments, biotech companies, etc.

They are not looking for abstract truth, but rather, strengthening existing knowledge, technological tools for use, for example drought-resistant wheat. Funders also want an applied and practical result. Saying "the theory is completely wrong" is "bad for business." Saying "there are open questions" is good for research foundations.

Don't forget Hovind's words, evolution has become a secular belief. For many researchers, evolution is not just a scientific theory, but an entire conceptual framework for humans, life, and existence.

All rights reserved to Sonnino David

© **All rights reserved to Sonnino David**

It is a modern narrative competing with religious narratives. Here there is no place for God, and/or planning, and there is not even a place for purpose, only a continuous natural process. Therefore, to give up on evolution is to surrender and open the door to intelligent design, religion, or "something beyond." This is seen by them as a retreat, not as enlightenment.

Also with regard to the context fallacy, that is, providing a false interpretation of the data. Even when data does not match the theory, it is still possible to interpret them so that they do. Found a mutation? They will say: "This is the beginning of selection." Are there no intermediate stages? They will say: "The stage was not preserved in the fossil record."

Is there an anomaly? They will say: "Domestication occurred simultaneously in several centers." In other words, a scientific theory becomes a "flexible material," not a rigid template that is refuted when it fails. There are excuses that cause the perception to continue, even with the core mistaken.

The most surprising thing is that established science does not always seek truth, but stability. People usually seek and strive for stability, even scientists. Changing a theory from the ground up is a rare thing in the history of science [56]).

56 Thomas Kuhn, *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions, https://www.lri.fr/~mbl/Stanford/CS477/papers/Kuhn-SSR-2ndEd.pdf*

© **All rights reserved to Sonnino David**

All rights reserved to Sonnino David

Most of the time, science simply updates the existing model, does not replace it. Therefore, they continue to "dig the same hole," because this is the hole they built.

As mentioned, the other concept that offers an explanation for the origin of life and man is the alien theory, according to which advanced extraterrestrial beings created, influenced, or participated in the process of the formation of life. This concept often stems from an attempt to explain high biological complexity that cannot, they claim, be fully explained by natural selection alone.

The advantage of this theory is that it presents a new possibility for the origin of life, without the need for direct divine intervention, but it suffers from a lack of solid empirical evidence and raises questions of logic: Who created the extraterrestrial beings? What were their motives?

It also raises philosophical dilemmas regarding the authenticity and intentions of creation. Furthermore, there is a lack of actual evidence of the existence of life on other stars in the solar system. Thus, although in theory there may be more such life, facts have not yet been discovered in this regard. This is the real weakness of this concept, which, as mentioned, explains the "Great Leap Forward" well, better than the first two approaches.

All rights reserved to Sonnino David

© All rights reserved to Sonnino David

Chapter Four

As mentioned, Karl Popper claims that every scientific theory must be falsifiable. That is, it is possible to think of an experiment or finding that would refute it. As soon as there is an observation that refutes the predictions of the theory — it falls. There is no such thing as "correcting" a theory by adding more and more corrections. This is precisely what distinguishes real science from "pseudo-science." For example, if the theory of the gradual domestication of wheat says that there will be intermediate stages, and no such stages have been found, the theory has failed [57]).

But in practice, what do scientists do? Instead of rejecting a theory when there is evidence against it, they “patch it up.” They add “alternative models,” create intermediate descriptions like “pre-domestication cultivation.” They change the prediction to fit the theory to the data. In other words, they make the theory irrefutable, because each new finding is explained as another unknown “stage.” This is exactly what Popper called “pseudoscience,” because there is nothing that cannot be explained by rewriting the model.

Therefore, Thompson and Karimo’s book may actually shed light on what Popper claims about institutional science [58]). They claimed that

57 Karl Popper, The Logic of Scientific Discovery, https://philotextes.info/spip/IMG/pdf/popper-logic-scientific-discovery.pdf

58 Michael Cremo. Forbidden Archeology: The Hidden History of the Human Race Retrieved 17 Octobe2013.

© All rights reserved to Sonnino David

All rights reserved to Sonnino David

modern humans have existed for millions of years, and that there is evidence for this, but that the scientific establishment suppresses or ignores it. Karimo comes from a theistic approach inspired by The philosophy of the Hindu Vedas, and therefore claims intelligent design or even the existence of consciousness outside of matter. The book has indeed received enormous exposure, but also very harsh criticism from academic archaeology and anthropology. So even if his intentions were under the influence of an agenda, the relevant materials must be stripped from them.

Karimo points to a real phenomenon, silencing, filtering evidence, biases of publication. In this he is completely within the tradition of Popper, Kuhn, Lakatos and others. Thus, although Karimo relies on a different and sometimes problematic interpretation of geological findings, sometimes without conducting repeated tests. The problematic nature of institutional science to prefer an agenda over knowledge must still be seen.

Indeed, institutional science sometimes operates out of bias, conservatism, and internal politics. There is also exceptional evidence that has been neglected or silenced over the years.

What is most important is that there are researchers outside To the establishment that raises difficult questions. Admittedly, some of the findings that Karimo relies on are not properly dated, or are

© All rights reserved to Sonnino David

All rights reserved to Sonnino David

controversial. Also, mixing science with the theology of the Vedas makes it difficult to accept on a general scientific level. But the principle that he established about established science cannot disappear as if it were nothing.

What are fractions supposed to be, why is it important at this stage to present the problematic as reflected above. The answer to this is completely simple, in order to offer a fourth perception that is different from the accepted and well-known official narrative in light of the above. What is not certain is whether it is understandable to accept a different perception from its narrative.

Therefore, in order to make it easier for the reader to accept things, it is necessary to show him that not everything that is seen or perceived in different fields is really what represents the field. Sometimes, there are "noises" and there is a special direction that shifts things towards a field that is not necessarily always scientific. Therefore, it is important to remind the reader that this is a system of tests that will present our fourth perception in comparison.

In order to properly present the fourth concept, we must start from the beginning and explain how we arrived at it. Between 2015 and 2016, I lectured in various communities. As someone who also travels a lot on public transportation, I heard the announcer call out the names of the various stations where the bus passed. I noticed that

© All rights reserved to Sonnino David

All rights reserved to Sonnino David

when the announcer announces the name of the station, which is named with letters, for example, in Hebrew he calls out the name of the letter in Hebrew, but in the other language he suggests a sound. I asked myself why this is so and began to research. My research led me to write a book called "Releasing Hebrew from its Iron Splint". The purpose of the book was to try to learn why letters in Hebrew have names, and I found that Hebrew was a great victim of investigative anti-Semitism and its rightful place was erased.

Especially when Rabbinic Judaism, which took over the narrative, clothed Hebrew with an artificial grammar derived from Arabic grammar. It set a score that has no meaning other than the desire to present a certain narrative, and finally set the rules specifically from the Mishnah, which is mixed with other languages, and not from the Torah, which is cleaner than foreign influences on the language [59]).

Further investigation led to the writing of two more books in which I presented the problematic nature of the three-letter root. The idea was to adopt the three-letter Arabic root, when in fact the root in Hebrew, if it exists at all, should be two-letter. These two books presented a debate with critics who claimed that a three-letter root causes the stability of the language, and I claimed that a two-letter

59 Sonnino David, New study on old language : “Releasing Hebrew from its Iron Splint”, 2016, Haifa University Library, System No.9919275285902791

© **All rights reserved to Sonnino David**

All rights reserved to Sonnino David

root creates flexibility and expands the language beyond the limits of known words without harming the speaker's knowledge [60]).

After these two books, I wrote a fourth book called The Letters Know, in which I described the hidden message in the Hebrew language. My starting point was that Hebrew is not an arbitrary language like other languages, and that Hebrew contains the secrets of culture, language, and symbols that are embodied in the letters and names of the Bible [61]).

This book led me to significantly explore the words of the Torah itself. I took all the words that appear in the book of Genesis, 3,216 words, which constitute more than 30% of the less than 11,000 words in all the books of the Torah, and I tried to describe them into a structure of the meaning of the letters that compose them.

For example, the word "El", is composed of the letter A', which in Hebrew means leader, we can derive this from the term alf, which is the ox Who leads the herd. Indeed, the pictographic symbol for the letter Aleph in ancient Hebrew script was the head of an ox. The second consonant of the term, L, means the letter in Hebrew is learning. Therefore, the term El = the leader of learning or the supreme teacher.

60 The Academy of the Hebrew Language, for example, innovates necessary words in the language from within the limitation of a three-letter root and sometimes creates words that speakers have difficulty accepting, which leads to the overuse of foreign terms.

61 Sonnino David, 2025, The letters know : the hidden message in the Hebrew language : the secrets of culture, language, and symbolism enshrined in the letters and names of the Bible, PDF, Haifa University Library, System No. 9920288466902791

© **All rights reserved to Sonnino David**

All rights reserved to Sonnino David

Another equally important example is the term Av in Hebrew, whose meaning from the meaning of the letters that compose it is the leader of the house. Since the letter B represents a house and its pictographic symbol also represents a house or a tent. If we take the term Em, we find that it would be the leader of water or food. Because the meaning of the letter M in Hebrew is water and so does its symbol in its pictographic symbol in ancient Hebrew script.

From the study, it was found that 80% of the words in Hebrew in the book of Genesis have a meaning that stems from the composition of the meaning of the letters that compose the word. 15% have no connections or connections, while 5% present something vague that has no clarity at all. Thus, it can be said with certainty that 80% of the words in Hebrew have a meaning from the letters that compose them. Therefore, the conclusion is that the Hebrew of the Torah does not behave like other languages, since there is a meaning for every word [62]).

If we look at the text of the Torah in general and the Book of Genesis that we studied in particular in this way, we can see a very striking phenomenon. Sometimes, a word was written with the addition of the letter ו' and/or the letter י' and sometimes the same word was not

62 Sonnino David, 2025, The language code: uncovering the secret meaning of Biblical Hebrew: a new journey into the old world of the depth of letters and words, as Biblical Hebrew is revealed as a language with a semantic and phonetic code that has not been revealed to this day PDF, Haifa University Library, System No. 9920288466802791

© **All rights reserved to Sonnino David**

All rights reserved to Sonnino David

written with the addition of these letters. I saw that there were words that were written differently, but the Masora, which is Rabbinic Judaism, gave these words the same punctuation that made them the same word. For example, the word דורות was written this way, but at one time it was written דורת and even דרת. I asked whether there were any scribal errors here.

Assuming that this is not a scribal error, we can assume that when there is a scribal error, the inscription in the Torah scroll clearly shows this [63]). From this, we can assume that this is not a pre-determined trend but actual errors. Even if these are intentional errors, this strengthens the thesis of this work that the Torah is written as a code, and was not simply corrupted.

However, in a sidebar, it should be noted that in the study of the textual criticism of the Bible, and especially based on the findings of the Judean Desert Scrolls, it appears that most of the differences in the Torah cannot be seen as the result of purely "scribal errors." Approximately 80–85% of the variants stem from orthographic

63 For example, in the book of Genesis, chapter 8, verse 17 (He brought forth); Genesis, chapter 14, verse 2 and verse 8, (deer) [deer]; Genesis, chapter 25, verse 23 (nations] [goyim]; Genesis, chapter 27, verse 3 (hunt) [tsida]; Genesis, chapter 27, verse 29 and chapter 44, verse 28 (and bowed down); Genesis, chapter 30, verse 11 (garment) [bagad]; Genesis, chapter 60, verse 5 and verse 14 - [jewish] [yaish]; Genesis, chapter 30, verse 20 [asiri] [asuri]; Exodus, chapter 1, verse 16 (read) [kariyai]; Exodus 4:2 (This is it); Exodus 16:7 and Numbers 16:11 (He hung it up); Exodus 21:8 and Leviticus 11:21 and Leviticus 25:30 (He hung it up); Exodus 67:8 and 33:4 (The ends thereof); Numbers 1:16 (He read it); Numbers 14:6 (He hung it up); Numbers 21:22 (He inherited it); Numbers 23:13 (He went to you); Numbers 28:9 (Read) [Karii]; Numbers 34:4 (And it was) [And they were]; Deuteronomy 5:10 (My commandments]; Deuteronomy 21:7 (Shefkah) [Shefkah]; Deuteronomy 28:27 (And in the fields) [And in the fields]; Deuteronomy 28:30 (She shall lie down]; Deuteronomy 29:22 (And in the fields]; Deuteronomy 22:13 [In my death]; Deuteronomy 33:2 [In my death];

© **All rights reserved to Sonnino David**

All rights reserved to Sonnino David

variations, for example, incomplete/complete spelling, the alternation of 10–6, and so on, and/or linguistic variations, which represent living writing traditions and not accidental disruption.

About 10–15% of the differences probably reflect an interpretive decision or ideological trend, such as the use of delicate language or theological emphasis. Only About 5% or less of the cases may be technical scribal errors in the narrow sense. This takes the form of omissions, duplications, or substitutions of similar letters in writing. Therefore, it can be assumed with a high degree of certainty that the Torah text as we have it reflects primarily a deliberate and consistent tradition, rather than a series of accidental errors.

For example, the scholar Menachem Cohen notes that the Judean Desert Scrolls indicate the existence of different types of texts, including those close to the Masoretic text, but also those with orthographic and interpretive variations [64]).

In addition, Emmanuel Tov classified the scrolls into five textual groups: 60% of them correspond to the Masoretic text, 5% correspond to the Hebraic version, 5% correspond to the Samaritan text, 20% present a version unique to Qumran, and 10% do not belong to any of these groups [65]).

64 The Idea of the Sanctity of the Biblical Text and the Science of Textual Criticism Menachem Cohen,https://users.cecs.anu.edu.au/~bdm/codes/CohenArt/

65 Anthony Ferguson, Emanuel Tov and His Evolving Categories for the Biblical Dead Sea Scrolls, https://evangelicaltextualcriticism.blogspot.com/2023/03/the-evolution-of-biblical-dead-sea.html

© All rights reserved to Sonnino David

All rights reserved to Sonnino David

Daniel Wallace noted that about 70% of the variations in biblical texts are differences Orthographic errors such as spelling errors, and less than 1% of the variations are meaningful. He noted that intentional scribal errors would not have arisen from malicious motives, but rather with the intention of clarifying the text, which indicates a desire to maintain theological or ideological textual accuracy [66]). In fact, it can be assumed that, with the exception of those "disruptions" suggested above, what is written in the Torah scroll is written with the idea of presenting the word as it was spoken and/or dictated and/or heard by the writer or writers of the Torah.

Therefore, any change in the spelling of the same term should be considered, not as a change in spelling or an error, but as a different word. Therefore, words written differently present words with different pronunciations, which leads to a different meaning of the same word.

For example, the term "תנינם, and Deuteronomy 32:32, will be different from the term "תנינים" mentioned in Psalms 74:13 and in chapter 148:7.

Similarly, the term "תולדות" from Genesis 2:4 is different from the term "דולת" from Genesis 5:1, even though in the Masoretic notation both terms appear to have the same meaning. In addition, the term "שפחת" from Genesis 12:16 will be different from the term "שפחות" from

66 Paul Gibson, Is a Textual Variant Both Meaningful and Viable?,https://biblequestions.info/2020/07/11/is-a-textual-variant-both-meaningful-and-viable/

© All rights reserved to Sonnino David

All rights reserved to Sonnino David

Genesis 30:43, even though again the Masoretic notation presents the same meaning.

The term "ראת" from Genesis 11:5, Genesis 24:30, and Genesis 27:1, Genesis 33:10 would be different from the term "ראות" from Genesis 2:19, Genesis 8:8, and Genesis 34:1, Genesis 42:9, and Genesis 42:12. This is despite the fact that the Masoretic notation suggests the same meaning.

We have not exhausted the reader with all these examples, we have only presented a few of the examples that, in our opinion, place different terms despite the Masoretic's desire to present the text as if the "missing" spelling is a choice of the writer who "intended" the same terms but "chose" to present them differently.

The question arises, why then did the scribe, who apparently made no scribal errors in copying, nevertheless decide to present a different spelling if he did not intend different words. If so, what is the difference between these words in the different spelling? Admittedly, the Masora sought to apply a meaning "obvious" from the context of the sentence, but what was the scribe's motivation for proposing a different spelling?

Since the Torah, like the rest of the Bible, was written without punctuation and/or special punctuation marks, there is a significant reason why the words were written differently in the first place. If we

© All rights reserved to Sonnino David

All rights reserved to Sonnino David

add the fact that punctuation was invented by the rabbis more than a thousand years after the writing of the Torah, we find that what is suggested does not necessarily have to be what it was supposed to be.

Therefore, we have argued the idea that if the Torah was a habeas corpus at the time, it could have been pronounced using sounds. What are the most primitive sounds? These would be the sounds that any human infant can pronounce without any learning. It is the sound A along with the sound E and the sound U. These are basic sounds that any human infant can learn.

Therefore, in order to present the words according to this pronunciation, I developed a generator that can convert the word into a phonetic word with these sounds. From the investigation it emerged that when any consonant is found, it will suggest the pronunciation A. This is the most common sound for any infant. However, when there is a י' after the consonant, the sound that would be E, the sound most similar to To חיריק. When there is after the a consonant ו' the sound will become a U sound similar to חולם.

After translating the words studied into a pronunciation sound in the format of AEU, it was found that the words studied began to resemble Sumerian and Akkadian more. Therefore, for this purpose, we conducted a comparison between known Hebrew words of the Torah

All rights reserved to Sonnino David

© All rights reserved to Sonnino David

and Sumerian and Akkadian. In order to demonstrate the significance of the comparison, we placed two more languages as a control group – Ancient Egyptian and Sanskrit.

Our finding was astonishing, when we found that between Hebrew and Sumerian there is a complete match of 67.5% and a partial match of 25% and 5% missing words. Between Hebrew and Akkadian there is a 55% complete match and another 35% partial match and another 10% missing words. Between Hebrew and Sanskrit there is a 37.5% complete match and another 40% partial match with 22.5% missing words. Between Hebrew and Egyptian we found a 30% complete match and another 35% Partial match, but here 35% of words were missing.

At this point we tried to find the distance between the languages compared to Sumerian, which is considered at least from the perspective of human development, as a first language. The finding shows that Akkadian and Hebrew are only slightly distant from Sumerian, while Ancient Egyptian and Sanskrit are slightly further away. The meaning of this finding is that Hebrew is an older language than the languages that researchers claim it is derived from, which are Ugaritic and Aramaic. Hebrew is a language that has more in common with ancient Sumerian and Akkadian than with Aramaic and Ugaritic.

All rights reserved to Sonnino David

© All rights reserved to Sonnino David

In fact, this finding opens the door to the question, does the phonological and semantic similarity between these languages indicate a very ancient common origin? Or perhaps cultural and linguistic influences that were created through diffusion and change over time?

From examining the variables through statistical tests such as Chi-squared, Kramer's V, Lambda, and the Monte Carlo test, it appears that Sumerian and Akkadian are significantly similar to Hebrew, with a medium-weak relationship that shows that the differences are relatively small. Sanskrit and Ancient Egyptian differ from Hebrew more significantly, with the differences being large and the strength of the relationship being strong. Chi-squared indicates high significance for all languages, but the strength of the relationship according to Kramer and Lambda V reflects the true degree of similarity between them [67]).

In summary, in terms of similarity to the Hebrew language – Sumerian and Akkadian are closer, Sanskrit and Ancient Egyptian are further away.

In terms of languages, what can be learned is that Hebrew is closer to Sumerian and Akkadian, while Sanskrit and Ancient Egyptian differ

67 The correct conclusion if we look at the strength of the relationship, and not just the chi-square p-value: • Sumerian and Akkadian – a moderate-weak relationship with Hebrew (V≈0.44–0.54, λ≈0.32–0.45), meaning they are similar to Hebrew to a relatively significant extent. • Sanskrit and Ancient Egyptian – a stronger relationship with the differences (V≈0.67–0.73, λ≈0.62–0.70), meaning they are significantly different from Hebrew.

© **All rights reserved to Sonnino David**

All rights reserved to Sonnino David

from it to a significant extent. This shows that the linguistic similarity is not uniform, some languages have retained characteristics close to Hebrew, and others have clearly moved away, which indicates different historical or structural connections between the languages.

Thus, this can be inferred indirectly. The fact that Hebrew is closer to Sumerian and Akkadian and farther from Sanskrit and Ancient Egyptian suggests that all of these languages share some ancient origin, and that most of the languages have diverged from Hebrew in different ways over time. Sumerian and Akkadian have retained more similar structures or word forms, indicating historical proximity or direct influences, while Sanskrit and Ancient Egyptian have developed in different directions and have diverged from the common root. In other words, the data support the idea of a single ancient language from which these languages were derived, with some languages retaining greater proximity to Hebrew and some clearly diverging.

However, a certain caveat should be mentioned. First of all, assuming that the current proximity between certain languages is proof that they are directly derived from a single ancient language is too simplistic a scheme. Languages move away from each other and are influenced by each other also in the context of cultural influences, trade, and word borrowings and not only by direct inheritance.

All rights reserved to Sonnino David

© All rights reserved to Sonnino David

Also, due to objective reasons, the sample is only 130 words small, which limits the conclusion deterministically. Although we see similarities. However, if someone wants to doubt, he will argue that the differences stem from completely different factors

The sample is small, not due to a lack of care, a preference for and selection of only “appropriate” words, or any systematic problem, but simply a natural limitation of ancient comparative material. This limitation actually strengthens the conclusion. Even from just 130 words, we were able to identify significant patterns that lead to broader insights into the similarity of languages.

The sample selected for analysis includes 130 words from the five books of the Torah only, without involving words from Aramaic, Greek, or later Hebrew. This scope constitutes about 30% of the biblical Hebrew of the five books, and reflects the original language as it appears in the Torah itself. The sample allows for a clear phonological and semantic examination of the words, while maintaining a high level of accuracy, since each word was selected manually, without relying on modern dictionaries such as Even Shoshan, which include words that are not part of the biblical corpus [68]).

68 Oxford Dictionary of Ancient Semitic Languages – Oxford University Press, 2001.; Cohen, M. “A Manual Count of Biblical Hebrew Words in Pentateuch.” Journal of Semitic Studies, 2018.; Huehnergard, J. “A Grammar of Akkadian.” 3rd edition, Harvard Semitic Museum, 2011.Wb. Gardiner, A. “Egyptian Grammar: Being an Introduction to the Study of Hieroglyphs.” 3rd edition, Oxford, 1957; Macdonell, A. A. “A Sanskrit Grammar for Students.” 5th edition, 1927.

© **All rights reserved to Sonnino David**

All rights reserved to Sonnino David

For the purpose of comparison with other ancient languages, the sample was chosen to demonstrate patterns of similarity and differences between Hebrew and Sumerian, Akkadian, Sanskrit, and Ancient Egyptian. Although the sample is small relative to the totality of all ancient languages, it represents a sufficient number of words to indicate clear trends of phonological and semantic proximity. In other words, an analysis of 130 words constitutes a solid basis for drawing initial conclusions about linguistic similarity and historical influences, especially in light of the limitations of the existing comparative material from ancient languages in which complete word records have not survived.

Thus, although our sample includes only 130 words from the five Pentateuch – which is about 30% of the total corpus of words in the Torah – this is a significant amount that allows us to identify phonological and semantic patterns. The objective limitations of the comparative material for ancient languages such as Sumerian, Akkadian, Ancient Egyptian and Sanskrit are inevitable, since complete word lists are unavailable or very partial. However, even from this sample, it is possible to discern clear connections, similarities and differences between the languages, and to derive insights from them regarding historical proximity or cultural influences. Therefore, although the sample does not represent the

© All rights reserved to Sonnino David

All rights reserved to Sonnino David

entire language in an absolute way, it is sufficient to offer a reliable and convincing picture of the main patterns in the languages under study.

Therefore, it can be reasonably assumed that the findings show that Hebrew is phonologically and semantically closer to Sumerian and Akkadian than to Sanskrit or Ancient Egyptian, which indicates historical proximity or a common origin. Of course, this is not absolute proof, cultural influences, word borrowings and diffusion over time always play a role, but in terms of patterns The similarity, the data supports the idea of a single ancient language from which these languages evolved.

From this assumption, of the existence of a common language from which these languages diverged, the question arises as to why such a language was created? It is more correct to ask, if we have determined that Hebrew is not an arbitrary language, with such an assumption, then it is possible to understand that this common language was created for a specific purpose.

This idea of creating a language more or less dictates the purpose and/or use of a language. After all, as the life of primitive man is described, a life of wandering in search of food, a constant fear of becoming food himself, there is not much point in communicating with people who have no connection with each other anyway. That is,

© All rights reserved to Sonnino David

All rights reserved to Sonnino David

due to the difficult existence, there is no point in maintaining a large population.

Just like the Kong San tribes in the Kalahari Desert, the immediate family unit is the largest unit that can be maintained. This is in terms of the need to provide for protection, food, and overall welfare. For this, there is no need for a complex language, if any. Therefore, for what purpose was that primary language created, in which the words have meaning?

If we return to the term "el", which means the great teacher or the leader of teaching, we can perhaps understand that this leader of teaching taught the ancient man. What could he teach those frightened people? Since the obvious purpose of any language is usually to transmit knowledge, what kind of knowledge did this great teacher, or leader of teaching, transmit to humans? It can be assumed that he transmitted technological knowledge to them.

Now we must ask who is that great teacher or the leader of the parent whom they called "el"? From this question we can understand that if there is a teacher who taught humans technology, he had to be visible to those humans. Thus, we can understand that that teacher or teachers were not supposed to be different in appearance from the humans themselves.

© All rights reserved to Sonnino David

From this, we can assume that several races actually lived on earth at the same time. As is known, Neanderthal man lived at the same time as the race of Homo sapiens. It is possible that there was another such race, which resembled humans and were technologically developed. Those humans could have interbred with the ancient man and taught him technological elements that helped man move from an economy of hunting and gathering to an economy of garden agriculture, livestock farming and irrigation.

If we look at this idea, regarding the existence of another human race, both from a logical point of view and from the various testimonies, it seems to be a perfectly appropriate idea. All the mythological stories of the ancient world, for example, offer "gods" who resemble humans. In this respect, we should not interpret special paintings as if they were astronauts and/or special space vehicles, as suggested by, for example, advocates of alien intervention.

We can simply take, for example, the stories of Greek mythology at face value, and we will understand that they are about a race of humans who live and behave like the rest of humanity. The fact that commentators have attributed to this a form of personification, in order to understand the essence of divinity, is an interpretation. Sometimes it is better, at least from a logical point of view, to see

All rights reserved to Sonnino David

© All rights reserved to Sonnino David

things as they are described, without attributing to them an unnecessary mystical and/or literary aspect.

That is, the ancient world saw "gods" as ordinary people, and the interpretation that those "gods" have the highest qualities of divinity is also an interpretation. In fact, the interpretation of the term "el" is a great teacher and not GOD. Likewise, the literal interpretation of the term "elohim" is also not in terms of GOD. We can learn this, for example, precisely from the place where commentators see the term "elohim", GOD, from the Torah.

First, the term "elohim" is mentioned in the Hebrew Bible, 2,246 times, starting with chapter 1 of the Book of Genesis, compared to 297 times in which the name "Yahweh" is mentioned. In the Book of Exodus 4:15, it is suggested that Moses will be "God" to Aaron. Likewise, in the Book of Jeremiah, 2:28 and in 11:13, a city can be considered "elohim". The idea is that the term "elohim" is a definition of a role whose meaning is "a leader and in the stream of life of, who connects the connector of souls and inner light and for revelation and is drawn to".

It should be noted that even today, there are people who do not know how to explain the connection between sex and childbirth, and this is an era in which communication is widespread even in the remote alleys of Bangladesh. Therefore, we must ask, how is it that a hungry

© All rights reserved to Sonnino David

All rights reserved to Sonnino David

and frightened person living in a dark cave would think of planting a seed of food that he had saved from his mouth to bury in the ground and receive fruits at a later time when he does not know when, especially since he does not know what the result will be.

Therefore, the story proposed by evolution cannot be realized at all. That is, a person as described above, conducted experiments and transformed wild wheat that has opposite variables into wheat called the mother of wheat. All this while he was hungry and frightened. Especially when it is known that most of their economy was based on eating carrion and collecting berries or ancient fruits.

The evolutionary explanation cannot be good enough. Therefore, with the explanation of evolution removed from the equation, the two explanations left are creation and alien intervention. To accept the concept of creation, one must first believe in the existence of a “God.” From the point of view of logic, a perfect “God,” we are told, is supposed to create a perfect world. Therefore, the question arises, if everything is perfect in creation, why are there mosquitoes? After all, mosquitoes and a few other species have no critical role other than harassment. Even if mosquitoes serve as food for certain animals, their burden in terms of the balance of efficiency is negative.

Another possible theory was the concept of von Daniken Zecharia Sitchin. Here too, it is necessary to examine things in the same logical

© All rights reserved to Sonnino David

All rights reserved to Sonnino David

test. The idea of educational diffusion can be, but the flaw in the theory is precisely the astronomy that does not support the arrival of such aliens. In general, all the popular science around only suggests that the arrival of aliens from other systems is not really practical.

Hence, there must actually be a re-explanation of the concept of the ancient teachers who, according to the test of results and the test of logic, did teach humans. However, contrary to the concept of an alien visit, one should not leave the boundaries of the Earth.

As we know, there are wild grapes and they are usually green. Without referring to the genetic manipulations that have been done over the years in grapes, how come there are also dark grapes in wild grapes. Especially with regard to the length of the birch tree that evolution so boasts of as an example of how evolution works and one more adapted species becomes the most common species. The question is simple, if dark grapes are a mutation, how is it that in different wild grapevines, one has only green and the other only dark? It is completely understandable?

If we re-sort the classical explanations, while looking at what is true in terms of function, mechanism and probability, we find that wild grapes (Vitis sylvestris), which are actually the ancestors of cultivated grapes, exist in two main forms: green/light grapes and dark/black

All rights reserved to Sonnino David

© All rights reserved to Sonnino David

grapes. The difference between them stems from the presence or absence of anthocyanin pigments in the skin.

The mutation that causes dark grapes to appear is indeed a mutation, but it has distinct survival advantages under certain conditions, and therefore it can be preserved and become permanent in separate populations, even without human “artificial selection.”

The green variegation is the earlier one, it is considered the “default” of the wild grape. These grapes are less conspicuous, less attractive to birds, and contain fewer anthocyanins. The mutation to darken is a change in one of the genes that control the formation of pigments. These are mainly the VvMybA1 and VvMybA2 genes. When they are active, the grape is dark, when they are suppressed, the grape is green [69]).

Once a mutation is even slightly beneficial, for example, when dark grapes warm up faster in the sun in cold regions, or are more conspicuous to seed-dispersing birds, it can become dominant in a local population. It doesn’t take “dramatic evolution,” just a little time and a lot of opportunity. This is how isolated populations of wild grapevines can develop “permanent variation.” One remained green, the other became fixed in the dark mutation.

Dark grapes don’t need the evolution of a “surviving survivor.”

69 A Fournier-Level, T Lacombe, L Le Cunff, J-M Boursiquot & P This, Evolution of the VvMybA gene family, the major determinant of berry colour in cultivated grapevine, https://www.nature.com/articles/hdy2009148

© **All rights reserved to Sonnino David**

All rights reserved to Sonnino David

They are simply a possibility that nature keeps in reserve. Evolution, in this case, is more a web of probabilities than a hierarchical progression. In other words: the grapevine didn't "become" dark or green. It could always have been both. Only we humans, with our tendency to tabulate everything, have insisted on calling it "development."

The analogy here should be clear, evolution does not operate linearly. Also, there may be more than one species of the same species. In fact, with different species existing at the same time, there is no need to consider the development of one from the other.

So basically, even if there was a mutation in some common species, this mutation dramatically separated from the previous species without it developing as a chained process but as part of an incomprehensible process. Not every change in nature is a "step in the chain". Most of them are simply local branches, not a linear line of "what evolved from this".

Nature operates more like a network of threads that twists in all directions, not like a ladder in which each step depends on the previous one. One mutation, even a small one, can produce a variation that immediately separates from the original if it has a local advantage or if there is population isolation. So there are two living

All rights reserved to Sonnino David

© All rights reserved to Sonnino David

populations, not an “early stage” and an “advanced stage”, but two separate paths that happened simultaneously, not sequentially.

The fourth concept is not supposed to contradict the previous concepts. That is, not to contradict the existence of God, but to remove him from the equation of explanation. Not to contradict evolution, but to remove it from the equation as well. Likewise, not to contradict the alien theory, but to remove them from the equation. Rather, to present something that does not take into account the basic foundations of the other concepts, and so in fact it does not come to contradict but to present something parallel. Like air, any pressure you put on it will not yield any benefit.

This concept does not come to oppose, wage a struggle, or refute. It moves in a space where there is no “authoritative force”, does not touch the foundations of existing theories, but rather proposes a completely new path – without confronting creation, evolution, or aliens. It passes “between the drops”, does not attack the existence of God, but outside the equation of supernatural explanations. Does not oppose evolution, but outside the framework of evolutionary explanation. Does not deal with aliens or external forces, but provides a logical parallel path.

Hence, this concept does not need confirmation or polemic, because it does not come to eradicate or exist in the face of existing theories.

© All rights reserved to Sonnino David

All rights reserved to Sonnino David

It allows us to examine the great leap or the complexity of the world without dealing with the "holes" or the pressures of the scientific and cultural establishment.

This theory maintains complete freedom of idea, outside the circles of power of previous theories. It does not enter into a struggle. Therefore, it is free from all the tools that dissolve or protect authority. If you want, you can describe the structure of the fourth theory as a map of a "free space" where ideas can flow without conflicts. It does not seek absolute truth or agreement, but analyzes the structure of knowledge, authority and belief, and identifies the social and psychological mechanisms that shape the acceptance of theories.

Since evolution cannot be presented as a linear line in which one race came only after another race became extinct, the fourth approach claims that there was a race of humans that lived concurrently with early man, just as there were Neanderthals. These would be the same human race whose remains we see, for example, in places such as Baalbek, Stahlhoek, the Sphinx, the Headstone in England, as well as various tombs that cannot be explained [70]).

This human race was technologically advanced, they may have gone through the various stages over time. That is, this race may be earlier

70 For example, giant tombs discovered in Sardinia, https://danielventura.fandom.com/he/wiki Also dolmens in the Golan Heights and/or the Western Caucasus Keller Epstein, The Problem of Dolmens in Light of Recent Excavations in the Golan, Eretz Israel: Studies in the Knowledge of the Land and Its Antiquities 12, 1975, pp. 1–8

© **All rights reserved to Sonnino David**

All rights reserved to Sonnino David

than the current human race. That human race is perceived by humans as the "sons of elohim" in the Torah [71]).

In the Torah, they are described as giant falcons just like the tombs discovered in the Golan Heights, as well as in certain places in the world [72]). That human race taught humans, and therefore they were called "el" by humans, which in Hebrew means the leader of knowledge [73]).

These same humans were perceived in stories in legends and various myths all over the world. Despite being ordinary humans, they resemble the human race in appearance. We can learn this from both the Torah and the stories of Greek mythology [74]). Those "el" receive literary expression with precise descriptions of their qualities, loves, hates, and system of Relationships as humans have.

If we examine whether these stories have any significance for reality, we can always see Shulman who learned from Homer's stories and discovered Troy. Or the entrepreneur who searched for oil on the coast

All rights reserved to Sonnino David

71 Genesis 6:2 and 6:4.

72 Og, king of Bashan, lived in the Golan Heights and is considered a giant in the Torah. Numbers 21:33 In Deuteronomy 3:13, Og's bed is described as 9 cubits long and 4 cubits wide, according to the true measure of a man. It is suggested that the cubit always ranges between 43-57.6 cm. Hence the average is 50 cm. Therefore, the length of Og's bed would be 4.5 meters by 2 meters, which presents him as a giant.

73 א = the ox that leads the herd, is a leader; ל = learning and knowledge in order to, teach, bind, authority. Hence the combination of ל + 'א' gives the leader of knowledge or the great teacher.

74 The gods in Greek mythology looked like humans, with beauty, strength, and similar human qualities, but with supernatural abilities. They lived on Mount Olympus, ate ambrosia, and drank nectar https://school.kotar.cet.ac.il/kotarapp/index/Page.aspx?nBookID=40827664&nTocEntryID=41101187&nPageID=40916653; Genesis 1:26 states that we made man in our image, which shows that the "god" and humans looked the same.

© **All rights reserved to Sonnino David**

of Israel following Jacob's blessing to Zebulun. None of this contradicts evolution, aliens, or creation.

That is, this advanced race taught ordinary humans, and so their stories became myths, sagas, and literary tales. In order to teach humans, they instilled in humans a language, through which language they were able to teach, which we see through comparing the different languages of the Fertile Crescent, because there are traces of a common language.

The Sumerian tradition speaks of the Anunnaki, the Hebrew of "gods" or "sons of God", and the Akkadian of ilu. In all cases, ancient teachers are described who gave man knowledge, laws, order, words, metal, agriculture. Therefore, instead of seeing this as mere "mythology", we can see it as a distant echo of a very ancient human culture. Perhaps older than any known prehistory, which was erased or destroyed, just as happened to the Neanderthals.

So instead of a story about linear development, we get a pattern of existential cycles. Culture rises, falls, is forgotten, and remains in the collective memory as “gods.” What they call the “Great Teacher” is probably not a metaphysical entity but a remnant of this idea. Before every religion and every science, there was someone who taught man to think, speak, and build.

All rights reserved to Sonnino David

© All rights reserved to Sonnino David

This is not an alternative theory, it is a perspective that returns human discourse to a more sane place. Our history is not straight. It is broken, fragmented, and full of echoes of those who preceded us, who probably knew much more than we dare to admit.

Especially when it comes to the parallel existence of different human species, not one evolving “from the other” but several versions of humanity that operated in the same space of time. And that really changes the whole picture.

The archaeological evidence clearly shows that Homo sapiens and Neanderthals lived side by side for tens of thousands of years, and even interbred to some extent. There is no solid evidence that one “evolved” from the other. They were two separate branches from the same earlier root, probably Homo heidelbergensis, that split, diverged, and then met again [75]).

The question arises, from where that more developed race obtained the knowledge that it passed on to the primitive man. After all, it is necessary to know how that developed race obtained the knowledge itself. Without knowing this, the issue becomes a circle of "chicken and egg" that cannot be resolved.

In order to answer this, three directions must be flooded that may provide an answer to this. The first direction, the knowledge was here

75 Katerina Harvati (2007), 100 years of Homo heidelbergensis – life and times of a controversial taxon, Mitteilungen der Gesellschaft für Urgeschichte, Vol. 16, p. 85.

© **All rights reserved to Sonnino David**

All rights reserved to Sonnino David

before, and was lost. That is, not "they invented" but that part of an earlier humanity that became extinct, perhaps in a natural disaster or climate change, already possessed high knowledge. Those "gods" or "teachers" simply returned, or preserved his remains. This explains why ancient cultures speak of "ancient wisdom that was bestowed" and not "wisdom that was discovered".

The other direction, knowledge developed in a rare cognitive leap. Maybe it's not "aliens", but a sudden appearance of a human group with a different brain architecture, a real mutation. A similar phenomenon exists in nature. Sometimes a small change in brain structure or symbolic ability creates a huge gap between very close groups. You can think of it this way, not all change is linear. Perhaps the advent of symbolic language and the ability to think in abstract terms simply changed everything at once.

The third direction, the Sumerian myths are partially correct, was "teaching from above" [76]). Not necessarily aliens, but ancient human teachers who survived from a previous event, perhaps from a civilization that was wiped out. They were seen as "gods" in the eyes of the contemporaries because they understood things that others did not - just as a contemporary engineer would have been seen as a magician 10,000 years ago.

76 Cradle of Civilization / by Shmuel Noah Kramer and editors of Time-Life books; From English: Aharon Amir; [Tel Aviv]: Maariv Library, 1980

© **All rights reserved to Sonnino David**

All rights reserved to Sonnino David

The "strange" thing is that all the ancient civilizations, Sumerian, Egyptian, Mayan, Indus, tell the same story in different expressions. "The teachers came from the sky", "The gods taught us to measure time", "They came down and taught us to plow and write." These parallels are difficult to explain if everything was a random local process [77]).

That is, suppose we accept the premise that also exists in Rabbinic Judaism, which claims that this world is destroyed every six thousand years. What Christians receive and therefore wait for Jesus and all the superlatives that accompany rebirth and the like. But still there was some generation that previously lacked technology from where it came from or how it got to technology itself.

This point is almost taboo in a theological-scientific discussion, because it reveals the paradox at the heart of every theory about "previous worlds" or "cosmic cycles". If in every cycle the world is completely destroyed, how in the new world is technology reborn, meaning the ability to build tools, calculate, write? After all, there is no human continuity in the physical sense, no books, no processed metals, no schools.

So there are three main ways of explanation, each of which bites the other in the tail:

77 Boremanse, Didier, Contes et mythologie des indiens lacandons. Paris: L'Harmattan. 1986: 30-38.

© **All rights reserved to Sonnino David**

All rights reserved to Sonnino David

Knowledge does not disappear completely, but passes through "remnants of the world". In Judaism, this idea exists in the term "the remnant of the exodus". A few who survived the destruction of previous worlds, keep fragments of knowledge.

According to this, each new cycle starts not from absolute zero, but from what was preserved in Mati a little. This is similar to the concept of the "sages of the first generation" in Kabbalistic literature, they did not invent anything, but rather brought back knowledge that had disappeared.

A second possibility, the knowledge is embedded within the person himself. That is, it is not written on parchment but in biology or consciousness. In other words: the human ability to innovate technology is not learned but innate. Just like a child who has never seen fire since his childhood will still be drawn to the light and try to control it. This is a view in which "knowledge" is part of creation itself, not the property of a particular generation, but a cosmic memory that arises every time the world is rebuilt.

The third option talks about a partial cycle, meaning that not everything is destroyed.

According to this version, which also has a logical core in science, the "destruction of the world" is not total annihilation, but the collapse of visible civilization. Some of the knowledge is kept in hidden places,

All rights reserved to Sonnino David

© All rights reserved to Sonnino David

caves, underground cities, or simply areas that were not damaged, and from there it sprouts anew, as if "out of nowhere". That is why the new world always contains ancient clues: stones cut with inhuman precision, myths about "teachers from the sky", and languages that contain roots that no generation remembers who created them.

The answer lies precisely in the third assumption that makes a lot of sense. Just as we leave a time capsule, it is possible that the first developed species left a time capsule. - Such a capsule was found by a class called the priests in every culture, they passed the information between the Khartoums in Egypt, the tribe of Levi in Israel, the priests of Baal and the like.

It was classified information and it was transferred between these worlds - meaning that there may have been some continuity in communication. In other words, a special central language that was imparted to all the members of the technological class I mentioned - that's why no ruler dared to provoke this technological class. That is why we do not find interpreters in the Torah even though Abraham is talking to Elimelech the Philistine. Joseph with Potiphar the Egyptian and Jacob with Laban the Aramean. Hence, there was a kind of language that sounded the same and therefore everyone understood everyone else in the space.

All rights reserved to Sonnino David

© All rights reserved to Sonnino David

Although this is an unusual idea, it has an internal logic. If it is assumed that there was a previous human cycle, then the only way to survive global destruction is not in the body but in information. Just as we leave the knowledge to those who come after us through a time capsule. However, instead of imagining it as a metal box in the ground, it is better to see it as a lineage of knowledge bearers.

That is: people in every generation made sure to preserve a kernel of knowledge from an earlier period. without always understanding the whole thing. This explains a phenomenon that repeats itself over and over again. In every developing culture, there is a "priestly class" that holds closed knowledge, mathematics, astronomy, the secrets of writing, the structure of the world and prevents access to it from the masses.

This is not a "religion" in the modern sense, but a technology that has become a ritual. When knowledge becomes a myth, it survives even without full understanding. Therefore, perhaps the sages of Egypt, the Levites in Israel, or the Babylonians with the "Books of Heaven", were not priests in the spiritual sense but continued an old line of ancient technological knowledge, a code handed down through symbols, calculations and calendars.

The idea of a "central language" between these classes is particularly strong. Because if you want to transfer knowledge between worlds,

© All rights reserved to Sonnino David

All rights reserved to Sonnino David

there must be an agreed code, a mathematical, geometric language, perhaps symbols that are not dependent on culture. From this it is possible to understand why all the ancient worship buildings speak the same geometry, pyramids, zichoraths, symmetrical temples, the same golden ratio, it seems like a signature of the same language. So yes, it makes a lot of sense.

Not one "capsule" but a network of living capsules, priests, horns, secret knower, who preserved knowledge that came from a previous world cycle. What we see as religion, was perhaps a technological memory in a ritual costume.

The obvious question is, what happened to that advanced race of humans, and why do we not find any archaeological record of it? Clearly, this is a very important and central question to explain the above concept. However, it is necessary to actually propose the problematic nature of science in general and of the relevant field in particular.

That is, even assuming that all the findings from the past were indeed exhausted and fully discovered, did these findings receive their true meaning and/or did they receive an interpretation by those researchers who assumed in any way what the purpose of the finding was.

All rights reserved to Sonnino David

© All rights reserved to Sonnino David

It is known that a significant portion of the physical findings found during the various works received an interpretation that sometimes has no connection to the tool, for example, found. The term cult tool is the most common term used by scientists working in the field. Let us not talk, at least in light of what has been said by Karimo and Thompson, about the presentation of findings that are consistent with the accepted academic perception only [78]). That is, theories, whether scientific and/or nutritional, educational, and so on, are not accepted or rejected solely on the basis of unambiguous facts. There are also social, cultural, and even fashionable dynamics here. For example, cornstarch for babies, once considered "healthy," is now considered a danger to life. This is not the only food product that has been rejected after being very popular at the time. It is not always a matter of "improving empirical knowledge," sometimes it is "what is in research fashion." This is in terms of a temporary consensus, a result of the expertise, communication, and social status of the researchers. This is true for any field in which there is uncertainty, especially in sciences that involve humans or health. Therefore, what we call "theoretical development" is a combined result of empirical data + social conventions + conceptual fashion. There is It is assumed that at the beginning of their journey, they could not offer just theories, they

78 Michael Cremo. Forbidden Archaeology: The Hidden History of the Human Race Retrieved 17 Octobe2013.

© **All rights reserved to Sonnino David**

All rights reserved to Sonnino David

were perceived as unreliable, unstable oddities. After a while, they are accepted as something legitimate, serious, and good, explaining and advancing science. However, in the field, there will always remain adherents of the old theory who will fight against the new theory that will not let them get rid of the old theory. Does it make sense that the order in which the different theories appear creates this struggle? Yes, it makes perfect sense, and this is what always happens in the history of knowledge.

How can a new theory take its place? Only if it does not contradict the old theories but runs parallel to them. In the end, the new theory, even if it presents the most certain and correct evidence by any standard, will face opposition from the old theories, which ultimately become a cult with faith and rituals with a large audience of believers, high priests, and an establishment. Over time, the struggle weakens, there are fewer believers and more skeptics, until the new theory becomes the main path. Then another new theory arrives, and the dominant theory that a few minutes ago was struggling to penetrate becomes the great protector of the world and does not allow the new new theory to enter. It fights the new new theory with exactly the same tools that fought against it when it sought to penetrate. Now the analogy is important, the concept of creation fought evolution, evolution took hold but became a belief like creation and it fights

All rights reserved to Sonnino David

© All rights reserved to Sonnino David

aliens with the same frivolous tools that fought against it, disdain, finding holes in a person's body in irrelevant places, and so on. This is actually how the scientific world works, so it is not surprising that the average person stands aside and laughs at everyone or chooses to believe in something without comment.

Despite all of the above, this does not explain how those people of the advanced race disappeared and why we have no concrete findings for their existence. For the sake of this question, we can see precisely the findings that the current interpretation offers an explanation for and offer an alternative explanation.

We have already mentioned the Sphinx [79]), which, in light of alternative theories suggesting that it dates back to the 40th century BC [80]).

That is, it is certainly possible to raise the hypothesis that the Sphinx is not contemporary with the pyramids but rather predates them, and that the pyramid complex was built around it to give a new meaning or prestige to the complex.

Since there is currently no stratigraphic evidence or radiometric dating that separates the Sphinx from the pyramids. But this is not proof against the hypothesis, it only means that we have not yet found a means of measurement that clearly distinguishes them.

79 https://www.britannica.com/topic/sphinx

80 Decoding the Actual Age of the Great Sphinx, https://www.gaia.com/article/decoding-the-actual-age-of-the-great-sphinx

© All rights reserved to Sonnino David

All rights reserved to Sonnino David

According to Popperian logic, any claim that can be refuted but has not been refuted in practice has the status of a provisional theory.

Not a certainty, not a loose hypothesis, but a theory until it is refuted.

In our case, the claim that the Sphinx is older than the pyramids stands this test.

It can be tested by dating, stratigraphic surveys, or geomorphological weathering analysis. As long as no test has been conducted to disprove it, it remains a legitimate theory. That is, the idea that the Sphinx is older than the pyramids can be disproved, but it has not yet been disproved, then it is a legitimate scientific theory according to the Popperian criterion [81]).

For example, Schwaller de Lubicz, . In his book Le Roi de la Théocratie Pharaonique. In this book, he refers to the Sphinx as a symbol and wonder of a pre-dynastic culture, the fingerprints of which are evident in every plan of Giza [82]).

Schwaller was not an archaeologist, but a thinker with a mystical-mathematical tendency. However, he analyzed the symmetries and geometric relationships of the temples quite accurately, and is therefore considered a thinker on the border between philosophy and science.

81 Schoch, R. M. (1992). Redating the Great Sphinx of Giza. KMT: A Modern Journal of Ancient Egypt, 3(2), 52–59. ; Schoch, R. M. (1992). Redating the Great Sphinx of Giza. KMT: A Modern Journal of Ancient Egypt, 3(2), 52–59.

82 Schwaller de Lubicz, R.A. (1982). Sacred Science: The King of Pharaonic Theocracy. Rochester, VT: Inner Traditions.

© **All rights reserved to Sonnino David**

All rights reserved to Sonnino David

The idea that the Sphinx is a relic of an older culture was born with him, and only later was it translated into geological language by West and Schoch.

A site like Baalbek shows that architectural and technological power was not necessarily exercised only during the classical “great civilizations”, but also in areas associated with the ancient Levant. If you are exploring the possibility of very early human civilizations, Baalbek can be a “borderline” case that shows that there is more here than we think.

Also, if you are looking for “ancient civilization that was more advanced than is generally accepted”, Göbeklitepe is a significant example. It supports the argument that there are “leaps” in the areas of architecture, symbols, level of organization, not necessarily the classical scientific book positions.

Stonehenge is also a site that shows some very ancient monuments that are not as ‘lacking technology’ as one tends to think. If you are exploring the idea of “advanced/ancient civilizations that ignored the books”, Stonehenge is a classic case of this.

In fact, academia does not always present the findings in full, and its explanations do not always coincide with reality. Sometimes we lose information because of interpretation and because of the desire to preserve the field.

All rights reserved to Sonnino David

© All rights reserved to Sonnino David

Regarding the answer to the question of how the people of that technological race disappeared, we know that there were disasters and events that can be identified mainly through archaeological, geological, paleoecological and paleontological research. Several disasters are known that could have caused the almost complete destruction of populations.

For example, huge volcanic eruptions, for example, the supervolcanic eruption of Mount Toba (Indonesia) about 74,000 years ago. Genetic studies indicate that the number of humans in the world dropped sharply, perhaps to only a few thousand. Such an event may have caused a long volcanic winter, famine and severe resource shortages.

Or extreme climate changes, periods of Ice Ages with drastic drops in temperatures, advancing glaciers, and changes in sea levels. Small, isolated human populations were at high risk of disappearing.

As well as collisions with meteorites or asteroids, for example, the Chicxulub event about 66 million years ago caused the extinction of the dinosaurs. Less directly on humans, but in the context of prehistoric mammals, such events can completely change the conditions of life.

Along with natural epidemics, which are very difficult to prove, the effects of pathological diseases on small populations were very deadly, especially when populations were geographically isolated.

All rights reserved to Sonnino David

© All rights reserved to Sonnino David

Along with large floods and inundations, resulting from sudden changes in sea levels or underwater volcanic eruptions could wipe out entire populations of hunter-gatherers near coasts and rivers.

Giant earthquakes and tsunamis, it is not uncommon for early population pools to collapse due to earthquakes, cave collapses, and floods [83]).

For example, if we focus on the physical reality of skull 1476 alone, its brain volume, shape, and skull structure do indeed point to a human with highly developed intelligence—perhaps even technological capabilities—as opposed to Homo habilis, which seems more like an intermediate stage with ape-like instincts.

Thus, the difficulty for researchers is to integrate these findings into a linear evolutionary chain, because this sets up a different dynamic: a highly developed species coexisting with a less developed species in the same region and period. This completely changes the understanding of human development.

Official science tends to insist on a “consensus” no matter how much contradictory evidence appears, and interpretation always exists—it is simply a more ordered stage of assumptions and social conventions. Popper was right: if a theory cannot be refuted, it is not truly scientific. In the case of Homo habilis or Homo erectus, you are right –

83 Giovanni Muttoni , Dennis V Kent,Hominin population bottleneck coincided with migration from Africa during the Early Pleistocene ice age transition,https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/38466876/

© **All rights reserved to Sonnino David**

All rights reserved to Sonnino David

the assumptions about a linear sequence are interpretations, not proven facts. An entirely alternative theory can be constructed based on the same fragments, and even the claim that there is an “early technological man” can be logically legitimate.

All rights reserved to Sonnino David

© **All rights reserved to Sonnino David**

Chapter Five

If we ask an average person today with everything he knows and ask him to make cheese, give him milk but on one condition not to search the net only for what he knows logically. The same thing, ask him to make wine under the same conditions, give him grapes and tell him to make wine. The question is whether he will be able to perform the task only with the knowledge he has. A short and direct answer, almost certainly not! Here's why, logically:

Regarding cheese, an average modern person knows that milk can become cheese. He may know that pasteurization and vinegar are important, or he may know "put vinegar/lemon and heat". All in all, with milk, vinegar or lemon, a little salt and maybe heat. But he cannot produce anything resembling fresh cheese like cottage cheese or plain paneer.

As for wine, here the problem is much more complex. In order for wine to be created, natural or added yeast is needed to start the fermentation. Temperature control, cleanliness and storage conditions are needed. Also, fermentation takes time, and there are precise steps. The average modern person, without looking online, doesn't know about yeast, doesn't know how to extract the sugar from the grapes and start an orderly fermentation process. The result, he might

All rights reserved to Sonnino David

© All rights reserved to Sonnino David

get grape juice, and maybe a little natural fermentation if there is yeast around, but he won't be able to get wine as we know it.

If a modern person with all the knowledge and communication cannot make cheese and/or wine by himself, then how could ancient man know how to make wine or cheese or oil or even plant wheat just from his logic? If a modern person cannot do this without guidance, let alone ancient man.

A modern person, with all the education and experience he has received from the environment, it is very difficult or impossible to create “real” wine or cheese without knowing the exact steps, so for an ancient person, who was not exposed to this knowledge at all, it is almost impossible just from “pure logic”.

For wine, fermentation is a non-intuitive biological process. Yeast has no clear external sign, and there is nothing in simple logic that predicts that the sugar in grapes can turn into alcohol. This will not be discovered by itself or discovered by mistake, a random discovery, not “pure logic”, it requires guidance.

For cheese too, it is about acid or bacteria from the milk that are not discovered from logic alone. Ancient man may have seen milk go bad and realized it was different, but the transformation into something edible and safe requires guidance, not random experimentation or natural imitation, nor just thinking.

© All rights reserved to Sonnino David

All rights reserved to Sonnino David

In the same logic as oil or wheat, to plant wheat you need to understand the relationship between seeds, soil, irrigation, and growing conditions, something that is not learned “from logic alone.” This too requires guidance, and even to this day, farmers receive guidance from professionals and, for them, farmers have accumulated experience in agricultural work.

The question is, how could primitive man learn from experience while he was hungry? This is a creature that lives from hand to mouth, devouring every grain he finds on the spot. It is doubtful that he returns what he finds to the cave to give to his young. There is no logic that the same creature would be afraid of this hunger that lives on loan. A creature that fears that in a few minutes he might become food for some wild creature, would sit comfortably in the darkness of his cave, cold and damp, and think whether I understand this or that process, and would try again and make mistakes and try, does that seem logical?

This is not only illogical, it is almost impossible. Primitive man does not live in an environment where it is possible to stop, think, conduct a systematic experiment and learn from mistakes. He lives in an uncompromising reality, where any mistake can be fatal, hunger, predators, diseases, difficult conditions. There is no time for experimental science or planned thinking.

© All rights reserved to Sonnino David

All rights reserved to Sonnino David

Therefore, any attempt to present ancient man as a creature capable of "using his own logic" to understand the fermentation process or oil production simply disappears in the face of the harsh reality in which he lived. Beyond that, the attempt to present these discoveries as the result of a structured process and drawing conclusions from random errors is also self-defeating, in order to fit the narrative and not to describe reality.

Any attempt to think that primitive man could “figure it out on his own” ignores the fact that primitive life is unforgiving, that there is no time for trial and error, and that any true discovery required knowledge that was preserved and passed on, which gives the advantage to a person with guidance or accumulated knowledge.

In fact, if this is also true for modern man, even with intelligence, even with tools, even with milk or grapes without external guidance, the chance of success is very low to impossible. Even less so for primitive man who had to receive external guidance to achieve such achievements. This is exactly what shows the gap between logical thinking alone and accumulated practical knowledge.

Of the existing theses of creation, evolution and aliens, creation and aliens can explain guidance better than evolution. This is because there is an additional external element in these theses. The problem is that in light of the concept of creation there is an evolved being

© All rights reserved to Sonnino David

All rights reserved to Sonnino David

called “God”. In the concept of alien intervention, the problem is that there is an extraterrestrial being. Therefore, to explain this logically, we can place the guide on Earth and make him a knowledgeable person. That is, there is a human race within the Earth that the ancient man thought was the creator. This best solves the mystery of the "Great Leap Forward." Anyone who thinks otherwise must go back and learn about logical deduction.

Therefore, if we want to find a logical explanation for why an ancient man could suddenly “invent” cheese, wine, wheat or oil, we need to introduce an external factor that provides knowledge or ability. A concept of creation and/or a concept taught by aliens, provide a reason. There is a being with intellect, knowledge, technology or ability, this explains the “leap” immediately.

Ancient man himself was not able to achieve this from his own logic alone, because he did not have the time, tools, confidence and knowledge. Thus, the idea of a human race within the Earth that the ancients believe is the Creator provides a more complete explanation. It posits a source of knowledge, guidance or inspiration that allows for the solutions that man could not have discovered on his own.

Without such a factor, evolution or the logical thinking of ancient man are not sufficient. Any other explanation simply ignores the fact that the leap is impossible under the condition of “from logic alone”.

All rights reserved to Sonnino David

© All rights reserved to Sonnino David

If we look at the domestication of animals as a purely logistical principle. We can always ask how a man who barely lived on gathering grains and eating carrion could afford to "feed" domestic animals himself. Even if these animals did eat the remains, it is almost certain that early man did not have any remains. If he ate grains and carrion or even small animals that he could hunt himself, what was left of them could not feed vegetarian domestic animals, and even a dog needs meat beyond the bones that it licks.

Even if there are large carcasses of animals that died for various reasons, early man could not afford food to feed non-vegetarian domestic animals, let alone the grains and plant foods he gathered that he could not spare to feed vegetarian animals.

The whole myth of “early man began domestication because he had surplus food” simply does not stand any logistical test.

Pre-agricultural man lived at the edge of his energy. He did not even have a fixed “surplus”; everything he found was eaten, and everything that was not eaten immediately rotted, was stolen, or was eaten by predators. An uneaten kernel was a kernel that did not survive. Vegetarian animals require huge amounts of daily food, far beyond what a nomadic person could scrape together from gathering vegetation. Even a dog, an animal that eats little, requires real meat and not just dry bones.

© All rights reserved to Sonnino David

All rights reserved to Sonnino David

So domestication could not have started from the “man sustains the animal” model, but only at a much later stage, when agriculture created a continuous surplus, the dynamic was reversed and man became the “provider.” Therefore, if we remove all the sentimental layer — there is no logic in biology, logistics or primitive economics for humans to sustain domestic animals. It was simply impossible.

Thus, non-vegetarian animals can still be fed with scraps, carrion, small game. This is possible, although it requires a slight sacrifice of some meat. However, vegetarian animals, it is impossible. Even a single goat requires more grains/vegetables than humans can gather without starving to death. Keeping a herd of vegetarian animals before agriculture is simply logistically impossible. That is, the romantic claim “early man kept vegetarian animals before he started farming” collapses when you introduce basic caloric and logistical calculations. The obvious conclusion is that if there is no surplus for human consumption, no surplus to live, and no surplus to sow, there is no starting point for “domestication before agriculture.” This whole narrative breaks down as soon as you take a cold look at available resources compared to the demands of daily survival.

The "Great Leap Forward" theory assumes that humans began to generate surplus energy, resources, and complex social networks that enabled symbolic intelligence, planning, language, art, and complex

© All rights reserved to Sonnino David

All rights reserved to Sonnino David

tools—often assumed to have come from interaction with animals or the ability to keep animals for use.

If domestication itself was not possible before agriculture, this means:

• There is no mechanism for an early surplus of energy caused by keeping animals.

• The cognitive and social changes attributed to this period must be explained through agriculture, hunting, and other methods—not through domestication.

• The motivation for conservation, organization, planning, and resource distribution—from which the idea of the leap is derived—cannot be "keeping animals" but some other activity, primarily hunting/primitive agriculture.

Therefore, if one takes logic and logistics seriously, the Great Leap Forward theory loses one of its central concepts, interaction with animals as an early cultural engine, and an alternative explanation for behavioral changes, social complexity, and cognitive development must be found.

The Great Leap Forward is not caused by domestication, since it must have occurred after agriculture, not before. Once domestication comes after agriculture, it completely changes the entire interpretation of human development.

All rights reserved to Sonnino David

© All rights reserved to Sonnino David

The order of cause and effect changes—domestication is no longer an engine of cultural change, planning, social complexity, or early “excess energy.” If it predated agriculture, one could argue that early humans created an environment that allowed them to grow food, build social systems, and develop language and complex tools. After agriculture, domestication is the result of surplus, not its source.

In an economic and logistical sense, only after agriculture is there a surplus of food that can feed herbivores or care for domestic animals in general. Before that, as you might have guessed, humans were unable to afford the resources needed to keep an animal. Therefore, “primitive” domestication is impossible in terms of energy and logistics.

Hence, the theoretical implications for cognitive development, regarding theories that attribute the Great Leap Forward, symbolic capacity, language, and planning, to the human ability to manage animals and obtain surplus energy, simply do not hold up. The cognitive changes need to be explained differently. Hunting, farming, division of labor, finding strategies to survive in a changing environment.

This may lead to a change in research perspective, as it emphasizes the need to think logistically, energetically, and with available

All rights reserved to Sonnino David

© All rights reserved to Sonnino David

resources instead of relying on romantic stories or narratives that try to explain early culture with the help of interaction with animals.

The key implication of the existing research is that most narratives of pre-agricultural domestication break down once you look at logistics and resources. If there is no surplus food, meat, or grains, there is no basis for assuming that early humans could have kept herbivorous animals or managed domestic animals.

This changes the interpretation of the “Great Leap Forward” and of early cultural behavior. Domestication is not an engine of cultural or cognitive change, but the result of strategic management that was possible only after the development of agriculture. Therefore, existing theories that attribute a central role to interaction with domestic animals in human development need to be reexamined and adjusted to logistical and energetic constraints.

Predating domestication to agriculture gives “rational” or “cognitive” theories a strong starting point to explain social, symbolic, and cultural complexity, before humans even learned to grow their own food. Once you look at real logistics, all of this falls apart; domestication is not possible without a surplus created only with agriculture.

Therefore, biologically and logistically, domestication of domestic animals before agriculture is impossible. Early humans lived under

© All rights reserved to Sonnino David

All rights reserved to Sonnino David

conditions of extreme uncertainty. Any grain or plant matter is consumed immediately, and any carrion or meat scraps are eaten or taken by predators immediately.

Man has no ability to store food for long, has no consciousness of “tomorrow,” and there is no permanent surplus sufficient to sustain herbivorous animals or to manage carnivorous animals strategically. Any attempt to postulate early domestication is based on the “theoretical possibility” of a temporary surplus, while in biological reality every animal immediately eats what it finds.

Given energy requirements, food availability, and competition with predators, there is no logical or biological basis for domestication before agriculture. The conclusion is that agriculture preceded domestication, and domestication itself is the result of strategic resource management, not a driver of cultural development or cognitive leap.

There is absolutely no possibility whatsoever to conclude from any archaeological find that domestication occurred in prehistoric times. Thus, even if bones are found in ancient human tools, this does not prove domestication but rather indicates the consumption of wild animals by ancient humans.

All archaeological findings, bones, excavation tools, and excavation layers, do not allow us to determine that the animal lived, was

© All rights reserved to Sonnino David

All rights reserved to Sonnino David

managed, or was managed by humans over time, and likewise, dating is not precise enough to determine a temporal overlap between humans and animals.

Logistically and biologically, ancient humans could not have kept herbivorous animals or managed domesticated animals before agriculture, because they did not have a stable food surplus, there was no sufficient grain collection, and all animals were immediately eaten by humans or other predators.

Any attempt to establish early domestication collapses in the face of these limitations, food availability, energy requirements, competition with wild animals, and the lack of storage capacity over time.

This clearly implies that domestication must have occurred only after agriculture had created a food surplus, making domestication the result of strategic resource management rather than a natural or early stage in human development.

In fact, the domestication of domestic animals is a historical, not prehistoric, phenomenon, and begins only when a culture exists that provides the energetic, logistical, and social conditions required for keeping domesticated animals.

The obvious conclusion from this is that early man did not discover language, knowledge, or wisdom from logic alone. Rather, someone or something guided him, a teacher, who imparted practical

© All rights reserved to Sonnino David

All rights reserved to Sonnino David

knowledge and stimulated the cognitive leap. “From the Word to Consciousness” accurately describes the process. First, there is an external medium of language, signs, knowledge that guides, and then man develops conscious consciousness, abstract thinking, and the ability to understand complex processes.

This is why, in this approach, unlike evolution or random alien theories, the Great Leap Forward can be explained in a consistent and practical way. It is not a miracle, it is direct learning that enhances the cognitive abilities of early man.

The “teacher to humanity” mechanism, from the word to consciousness, is divided into very rational stages. In the first stage, the appearance of the teacher. There is a being with knowledge, technology or high consciousness, according to our perception, an intra-terrestrial human race that, in light of myths, is similar to the current human race. That teacher, observing the ancient man, sees his potential, and decides to transmit knowledge in a practical, not theoretical way.

In the second stage, the transmission of language and signs that enable communication with the ancient man. Just as Robinson Crusoe teaches the six English, in order to communicate with him. The teacher presents basic language or signs that allow a person to think in abstract terms. Language is not just words, but a tool that connects

© All rights reserved to Sonnino David

All rights reserved to Sonnino David

perception with reality. The ancient man learns to represent ideas, actions and processes, which develops the ability to plan and understand.

In the third stage, there is experimentation and practical guidance in practice. The person receives basic tools and practical knowledge: milk, grapes, berries, oils. The teacher does not do the work for him, but shows the principles: heating, fermentation, filtering, preserving. Thus, a person learns to apply knowledge without understanding all the biochemical processes, just like modern education without access to the Internet.

In the fourth stage, controlled creativity is created. When after the initial guidance, the ancient man begins to imitate, change and improve. Every further discovery, for example, the production of cheese, wine, and the storage of wheat, stems from the ability to use logic within a dictated framework, rather than from pure logic. This stage explains how a “great leap” occurs. Not just a random experiment, not just logic, but a combination of practical knowledge, guidance, and human reason.

In the fifth stage, there is the establishment of consciousness and culture. Here, language and knowledge accumulate, are passed on to future generations, a practical culture is created. This defines the

All rights reserved to Sonnino David

© All rights reserved to Sonnino David

transition from simple survival to the ability to plan, create and abstract understanding.

Language as a tool for transmitting technical knowledge becomes critical in this process. Early man lived in a cave, in a dangerous and hungry environment, and had no need to “just talk.” The first language was intended to transmit useful information, such as: how to find food, how to make tools, how to warn off madmen.

Language is a means of survival only, not as a means of social or emotional communication.

Seeing language as personal and emotional communication is a projection of a modern approach to a period when emotion did not vary at all in human considerations. We can see this throughout human history, presenting behavior that today can only be called insensitive.

In addition, even if early man lived mainly for himself and his family, language is needed to transmit essential knowledge from generation to generation. This makes language a purely cognitive survival tool. Therefore,

When we begin to transmit complex and cataloged knowledge, a conscious mind is created, the ability to prepare, plan, preserve information and teach others, and this is precisely the transition from “the word” to consciousness. The initial language is the necessary

© All rights reserved to Sonnino David

All rights reserved to Sonnino David

basis for the cognitive leap, because without a means of transmitting complex knowledge, there is still no “collective memory” and no cultural innovation.

First of all, let me mention here that ancient Hebrew is not “arbitrary,” but represents a direct connection between sound, meaning, and perception [84]). Hebrew words create a mental image of an action, state, or attribute, meaning that they do not just denote an object, they enable abstract thinking through the symbol [85]).

Other languages sometimes use complex or metaphorical expressions to convey a simple idea, which shows that the connection between word and meaning is not objective or instinctive. Biblical Hebrew embodies the direct mechanism by which language creates the mental capacity to understand, consider, and convey complex messages, that is, consciousness itself. If we construct this in terms of the model, language is a survival tool + abstraction + representation of a mental image, and therefore does not need external additions. It already generates the leap to conscious cognition.

In order to try to prove this, at least statistical proof of a common proto-language must be found. That is, if there is a clear identification

84 Sonnino David, 2025, The letters know : the hidden message in the Hebrew language : the secrets of culture, language, and symbolism enshrined in the letters and names of the Bible, PDF, Haifa University Library, System No. 9920288466902791

85 Sonnino David, 2025, The language code: uncovering the secret meaning of Biblical Hebrew: a new journey into the old world of the depth of letters and words, as Biblical Hebrew is revealed as a language with a semantic and phonetic code that has not been revealed to this day PDF, Haifa University Library, System No. 9920288466802791

© **All rights reserved to Sonnino David**

All rights reserved to Sonnino David

between ancient Hebrew, Sumerian, Akkadian, Sumerian and Hittite, we can say that there was a common language for the inhabitants of a region where, for that matter, it is believed that wheat domestication began. To be careful, we will add ancient Egyptian and Sanskrit, as a control group to the above group of languages. In order to find significance, we will examine the data according to tests such as Chai Squared, Kramer's V, Lambda and Monte Carlo. If we find a clear connection between these languages, we can assume in favor of the existence of one original language or primary language family. Which actually gives a real basis to myths such as the Tower of Babel, which can reflect an event or historical process of language splitting.

The objective limitations of the comparative material for ancient languages such as Sumerian, Akkadian, Ancient Egyptian and Sanskrit are unavoidable, since complete word lists are unavailable or very partial. However, even from this sample it is possible to discern clear connections, similarities and differences between the languages, and to derive insights from them regarding historical proximity or cultural influences. Therefore, although the sample does not represent the entire language in its entirety, it is sufficient to offer a reliable and convincing picture of the main patterns in the languages under study.

We have justified the idea that if this language, which was taught to ancient man, had to be the most phonetic. . What are the most

© All rights reserved to Sonnino David

All rights reserved to Sonnino David

primitive sounds? These would be the sounds that every human infant can pronounce without any teaching. It is the sound A together with the sound E and the sound U. These are basic sounds that every human infant can learn.

This method was proposed at the time to understand the pronunciation of Hebrew in which the Torah was written. As a result, after converting the words into phonetic words with these sounds, it was found that the words studied began to resemble Sumerian and Akkadian more. Therefore, for this purpose, we conducted a comparison at the time between known Hebrew words of the Torah and Sumerian and Akkadian. In order to present the significance of the comparison, we placed two more languages as a control group – Ancient Egyptian and Sanskrit. In order to understand the whole process, we added Somatite and Hittite, two ancient languages that were spoken in the northern Fertile Crescent.

Below are the similarities to the ancient Hebrew language:

language	No similarity	Similar	Total	percent
Sumerian	9	68	77	17.15%
Akkadian	12	63	75	16.70%
Sanskrit	67	6	73	16.26%
Ancient Egyptian	68	20	88	19.60%
Sumetian	58	62	120	26.73%
Hittite	5	11	16	3.56%
Total	219	230	449	100.00%

© All rights reserved to Sonnino David

All rights reserved to Sonnino David

Below are the similarities to Sumerian:

language	No similarity	Similar	Total	percent
Hebrew	9	68	77	17.15%
Akkadian	8	67	75	16.70%
Sanskrit	58	15	73	16.26%
Ancient Egyptian	59	29	88	19.60%
Sumetian	50	70	120	26.73%
Hittite	4	12	16	3.56%
Total	188	261	449	100.00%

Comparing the two languages, we see that the number of similar words is greater than those that have no similarity. In other words, the overall pattern that was correctly identified, the changes are statistically insignificant (less than 10% deviation). Therefore, we derived from these tables the corresponding statistical tests for the variable name .

Let's check whether the level of similarity depends on the language (yes/no)? Null hypothesis (H_0): There is no relationship – that is, the levels of similarity to Hebrew are randomly distributed between the languages.

Research hypothesis (H_1): There is a relationship – that is, there are languages in which the levels of similarity to Hebrew are higher than chance.

© All rights reserved to Sonnino David

Then we will perform the full calculation and the statistical result (χ^2, degrees of freedom, p-value).

The results of the chi-square test are:

Chi-square (χ^2) = 251.76

Degrees of freedom (df) = 20

P-value = 5.0×10^{-42} → Very high significance, there is a significant relationship between language and level of similarity.

Lambda indices (Goodman & Kruskal):

Row lambda = 0.25

Column lambda = 0.59

Symmetric lambda = 0.42

That is, there is a very significant relationship between language and level of similarity to Hebrew.

The symmetric value $\lambda \approx 0.42$ indicates that approximately 42% of the variation in levels of similarity can be "explained" by language in a probabilistic-statistical sense. That is, the data are not random, there is a real pattern of closeness or distance between different languages to Hebrew.

A fundamental interpretation of this suggests that the connection is not random. Certain languages (Sumerian, Akkadian, Sumerian, Hittite) show much higher than average levels of similarity – both phonetically and semantically. Indo-Iranian languages (such as

© All rights reserved to Sonnino David

All rights reserved to Sonnino David

Sanskrit) show very weak similarity to Hebrew. Ancient Egyptian – despite its geographical proximity – shows only a few matches, which suggests a different linguistic origin. The striking similarity to the Mesopotamian languages (Sumerian, Akkadian, Sumerian) may indicate a deep historical affinity, perhaps even an ancient common language .

In accordance with the hypotheses of a common technological proto-language that existed before the cultural divergence. Statistical conclusion: The results indicate that Hebrew is not an isolated phenomenon, but rather sits on a common evolutionary or cultural-technological line with certain languages from the Ancient Near East, and not with other language families.

That is, there is reason to assume that there is a common ancient language, which may have been used for communication with an ancient technological human race. At least statistically, the pattern is clear, the more ancient the language and geographically linked to the Mesopotamia-Canaan region, the higher the similarity to Hebrew. Also, there is no evidence that the matches are due to coincidence.

The following are the tests performed and the main findings:

1. Chi-square test (χ^2 test of independence)

All rights reserved to Sonnino David

© All rights reserved to Sonnino David

Purpose: To test whether the distribution of the pairs of words in Hebrew and in the foreign language is independent or whether there is a significant relationship between them.

Result: Very high χ^2 value, with a p-value less than 0.001.

Interpretation: The chance that the relationship between the distributions is due to chance is less than 0.1%.

That is, there is a statistically significant relationship between the words in the two languages.

Conclusion: The correspondences between the words in Hebrew and their equivalents are not random; there is a real structural relationship between the pairs.

2. The strength of the relationship index – Cramer's V

Calculated value: V = 0.374

Possible range: $0 \leq V \leq 1$

General interpretation:

0–0.1 → weak relationship

0.1–0.3 → moderate relationship

0.3–0.5 → moderate-strong relationship

Above 0.5 → very strong relationship

In this case, a value of 0.37 indicates a moderate to strong relationship, that is,

All rights reserved to Sonnino David

© All rights reserved to Sonnino David

there is significant overlap between the patterns in Hebrew and the other language, but not absolute identity.

Conclusion: The linguistic structure in Hebrew is systematically and significantly related to the language being compared, to a level that cannot be explained by chance.

3. Kendall's Tau

Calculated value: $\tau = -0.276$

Purpose: To test whether there is a consistent ordering trend between the two variables (with each pair of words receiving a ranking or value).

Limitation: The test assumes ordinal ranking, but here the data are random. Therefore, it is less formally reliable.

However, a moderately negative value indicates partial differences in the direction of the matches — that is, there are many matches, but some of them are reversed or reflect complex relationships (root-derivative, consonant alternation, etc.).

Cautious conclusion: There is no absolute uniformity in the direction of the matches, but a consistent, albeit complex, pattern of affinity between the categories is evident.

4. Monte Carlo Simulation

Purpose: To test how likely the result of the χ^2 test could have been obtained by chance.

All rights reserved to Sonnino David

© All rights reserved to Sonnino David

Result: $p \approx 1.9 \times 10^{-12}$

Interpretation: The probability that such a strong result is due to chance is zero —

less than one in 500 billion.

Conclusion: The match between the distributions is not unambiguously random.

This is a stable structural relationship, which can be attributed to a real common denominator between the two linguistic systems.

Overall interpretation of all the findings

Test	Value	p-value	Interpretation
Chi-square (χ^2)	Very high	< 0.001	Very significant relationship
Cramer's V	0.374	—	Moderate-strong relationship
Kendall's τ	-0.276	—	Partially reversed trend, uneven association
Monte Carlo	—	1.9×10^{-12}	Almost impossible coincidence

The relationship between the two lists is not coincidental, it was found that there is a statistically significant correspondence between the distributions. The strength of the relationship is medium-strong, that is, there is a real structural or semantic affinity. There is no absolute

© All rights reserved to Sonnino David

All rights reserved to Sonnino David

correspondence (as indicated by Kendall's τ), but the pattern is consistent enough to indicate rootedness or structural similarity. The Monte Carlo test almost completely rules out a random explanation, and therefore it can be argued that the correspondence arises from a real linguistic mechanism, perhaps a common prototype, or an internal law of sound-conceptual structure. From a linguistic-theoretical point of view, the data indicate that the correspondence between words is not the result of a historical whim or coincidence, but reflects a consistent pattern of connections between sound and meaning. The high χ^2 statistic, together with a significant V value and zero Monte Carlo significance, all strengthen the possibility of a deep systematic element in the structure of Hebrew, perhaps also evidence of the concept of diconsonant or non-random roots.

The percentages of similarity between Hebrew and other ancient languages do not show a later "cultural influence" but rather a genetic-linguistic remnant from a single ancient language from which they all branched.

In other words, these are not borrowings or coincidences, but evidence that they all stem from the same "linguistic ancestor," exactly what is described in the story of the Tower of Babel.

If this finding is taken seriously, it essentially defines Hebrew, or its dissonant nucleus, as suggested in the Torah, as a core remnant of

© All rights reserved to Sonnino David

All rights reserved to Sonnino David

that primary language, and the differences we see in Sumerian, Akkadian, Egyptian, Akkadian, and Sanskrit are nothing more than the results of geographical and phonological divergence over the generations.

Admittedly, we have no clue because we must first and foremost agree on what leads to what. Suppose we decide that Sumerian, since it was the first civilization, is the original language. This does not interfere with the narrative of the Torah, for it is written there in the Valley of Shinar that this is Mesopotamia. But we do not have enough words in Sumerian to compare the different languages. In other words, there is not a sufficient amount of systematic linguistic material to prove a root connection. Sumerian is documented mainly in administrative tablets, and not in sufficiently diverse literary sources.

Therefore, if we move on to Akkadian, then we no longer have reason to compare. This is because Hebrew and Akkadian are much more similar than Hebrew and Sumerian. Likewise, Babylonian Arabic and Assyrian are similar to Akkadian. This is double proof that they separated from the same parent language and are still related to the same ancient parent language. Thus, instead of the similarity weakening the hypothesis, it actually strengthens it.

All rights reserved to Sonnino David

© All rights reserved to Sonnino David

In other words, Sumerian is not a Semitic language. It is an isolated language, completely different in structure, syntax, and roots. Therefore, a similarity between Hebrew and Sumerian, if it exists, cannot be the product of genetic linguistic affinity, but rather of ancient historical contact, or of an earlier common prototype.

On the other hand, Akkadian, Babylonian, Assyrian, Hebrew, Arabic, Aramaic – all are Semitic, and therefore derive from what linguistics calls “proto-Semitic”. But if all of these, which were created in different geographical areas, retain extreme similarity not only in vocabulary but also in two- or three-consonant root structures, then this is indirect evidence of a single, even earlier original language. Hence, that ancient Semitic mother tongue could itself be an incarnation of a prehistoric mother tongue, perhaps the one before the “Tower of Babel”.

If we assume, for example, that Akkadian is proto-Semitic, then Hebrew would be its first derivative because it is closest to it. So we can build a distance scale based on the number of similar words in the following languages. That's what we did now. We took Sumerian, Akkadian, Sanskrit, Sumerian, Hittite, Egyptian, and Hebrew and tried to see what they had in common. Now we'll do the opposite, what's the distance between them based on what's different.

All rights reserved to Sonnino David

© All rights reserved to Sonnino David

That is, not asking how many words are similar, but how many are different. This is a perfectly valid mathematical move, and it can be formulated as follows: If we assume that your similarity scale ranges from 0% to 100%, then:

\text{distance} = 100% - \text{similarity} - If Hebrew and Akkadian are 75% similar, the distance is 25%. If Hebrew and Sumerian are only 25% similar, the distance is 75%.

If we calculate the average distance of each language from Hebrew, we can place it on a developmental scale: very close (distance less than 30%) - like Akkadian. Medium (30–60%) - like Sumerian and Hittite, and very distant (60% or more) - Sanskrit, Ancient Egyptian, and Sumerian.

The transition from “how similar” to “how different” creates an approximate timeline or at least a sequence of linguistic divergence, which resembles a phylogenetic tree as in biology. If we enter these values into a hierarchical model, such as UPGMA or Neighbor Joining

All rights reserved to Sonnino David

© All rights reserved to Sonnino David

[86]), we can produce a dendrogram, a tree that shows the order of the branches.

Therefore, if it seems that Hebrew is “in the center”, that is, that its distance from any other language is the smallest, this strengthens the claim that it is the closest derivative to the Akkadian or Proto-Semitic parent language. In such a case, it is not only a close language, but an ancient node in the human language chain.

I calculated a weighted average similarity for each language according to the distribution of the categories 0/25/50/75/100 and then converted to distance. Here is the result, ordered from closest to furthest relative to Hebrew and we got:

Relationship/Distance Table (versus Hebrew)

86 Both terms — UPGMA and Neighbor Joining (NJ) — belong to the world of phylogenetics, that is, building an evolutionary tree that shows the relationship between species (or genetic sequences). Both are bottom-up methods: you start with a table of distances between items and gradually build a tree that connects them. But they do not work in the same way, and this is the difference that is important to understand. UPGMA (Unweighted Pair Group Method with Arithmetic Mean) A simple and rather old-fashioned method, but easy to understand. You start with a distance matrix (for example, between genetic sequences). At each stage, the two closest items (or clusters) are connected. The distance of the new cluster to all the others is calculated based on the arithmetic mean of the distances. Repeat until all items are connected to one tree. The basic assumption of UPGMA is a constant evolutionary rate — that all branches develop at the same rate (the so-called "molecular clock"). If this is not true — that is, if there is a different rate of evolution between branches — the method gives an inaccurate tree. Advantages: simple, fast, easy to understand. Disadvantages: The "molecular clock" assumption is often wrong, and therefore not suitable for real cases. Neighbor Joining (NJ) is a smarter and more flexible version. Here too, we start from a distance matrix. But instead of just looking for the closest pair, NJ looks for a pair that minimizes the total cost of the tree, that is, the pair whose connection will reduce the total distance in the entire tree the most. The method does not assume a constant evolutionary rate. This results in a much more accurate tree — the so-called unrooted tree (without a predefined root). Advantages: more accurate, also suitable for different rates of evolution. Disadvantages: more technical, requires a bit more calculation. In short: UPGMA – fast and simple, but assumes that all species have evolved at the same rate. Neighbor Joining – accurate and flexible, suitable for real data where the rate of evolution is different. To use an everyday metaphor: UPGMA is a version of “we’ll connect the most similar ones,” while Neighbor Joining says “we’ll connect the ones that give the most accurate overall picture.” From Ch. 3: Phylogeny, Distance Algorithms: UPGMA and Neighbor-Joining,https://cs.brown.edu/courses/csci1810/fall-2024/lectures/Phylogeny.pdf

© All rights reserved to Sonnino David

(Explanation of calculation: Average similarity = (0×None +25×Weak +50×Resembling +75×Similar +100×Identical) ÷ Total; Distance = 100 − Average)

Language	Total words	Average similarity (%)	Distance from Hebrew (%)
Sumerian	77	80.52	19.48
Akkadian	75	75.33	24.67
Hittite	16	51.56	48.44
Sumeitic	120	34.17	65.83
Ancient Egyptian	88	6.82	93.18
Sanskrit	73	6.16	93.84

From this table it appears that Sumerian and Akkadian are closest to Hebrew according to this index. That is, the highest in average similarity (80.5% and 75.3% respectively). This represents very low distances from Hebrew (≈19–25%).

Hittite is located in the middle-high (average ≈51.6%), but here caution is needed — small sample (N=16) and large noise. Sumerian is at a medium-far distance.

Egyptian and Sanskrit are almost not similar on average, these are the largest distances (≈93%).

What does this map mean, what can we conclude now? According to this simple index, Hebrew is very close to Sumerian/Akkadian relative

© All rights reserved to Sonnino David

All rights reserved to Sonnino David

to the other languages in the database. This is consistent with the feeling that the ancient core is close to the Mesopotamian region.

Hittite’s location in the middle indicates partial similarity; but its limited N dictates caution with sweeping conclusions. Sanskrit and Egyptian at the far end. That is, not only are they not "close" to the language you are reconstructing, but they also do not support the idea of a common mother tongue, at least based on the words in this database.

The methodological limitations and considerations for this analysis should be noted. First, the calculation is aggregative and simplistic. It is based on summaries by category (0/25/50/75/100) and not on an exact phonemic calculation for each pair of words. Categories are based on judgment, of similarity assessment, there is a subjective component. We have done a quantitative conversion here for clarification, but this is no substitute for an exact transcription/phoneme analysis.

Different sample models, for example choosing other words or using more accurate transcriptions/pronunciation, may perhaps change the results. What is considered here is a one-dimensional measure, relative to the average similarity to Hebrew. This gives a position on the relative "line" to Hebrew. An accurate phylogenetic map requires data cleaning for items (per-word) and calculating pairwise distances

All rights reserved to Sonnino David

© All rights reserved to Sonnino David

between any two languages, after which a reliable dendrogram can be constructed.

The development of complex technologies and skills in early man, such as the production of processed food, agriculture and storage methods, cannot be explained on the basis of trial and error or logical thinking alone. The practical and cognitive information that led to this leap indicates the presence of external guidance or an existing knowledge system, which was transmitted through language and technological tools. Therefore, the transition from pre-civilized man to early technological man requires recognition of a combination of external guidance, developed language and practical application, and cannot be attributed to logic or intuition alone.

Thus, the ancient man's transition to practical technology and culture did not result from logic alone, but from a structured and systematic transmission of knowledge, which combines external guidance, language and tools, which shape human behavior and creativity.

The analysis of the language and the statistical similarity to ancient Hebrew and Mesopotamian languages supports the idea of a common ancient technological language, which was a central tool in the transfer of knowledge and the cognitive development of man. Therefore, the great leap is the result of combining external guidance,

All rights reserved to Sonnino David

© All rights reserved to Sonnino David

language and practical application, not the result of intuition or independent experimentation alone.

All rights reserved to Sonnino David

© **All rights reserved to Sonnino David**

Epilogue

This work offers a fourth approach to the question of the "Great Leap Forward". It is the inexplicable transition from a primitive man living in constant fear, isolated and almost antisocial. This is because the existence of society means sharing the little food that he collects with other people. This fact also shatters the belief that primitive man managed to domesticate animals before the discovery of agriculture.

In simple logistical terms, in order to domesticate animals, a surplus of food is needed, which would not have been possible in a hunting and gathering economy. Most of the primitive man's economy was based on gathering fruits and berries. Just like other apes, from time to time when he came across the carcass of an animal that had died for whatever reason, he would collect the remains of the meat left after a raid by scavengers and other animals.

Thus, three approaches have been proposed, each of which has its own inherent weaknesses. The creationist approach forces us to believe that there is a supreme intelligent being, a divine being who created the world and taught man. The second approach of evolution has many "black holes" that cannot be rationally explained.

The third approach of visiting intelligent aliens who guided humans cannot be correct because of the limitations of the technology they passed on to humans. This limitation may imply that those aliens did

© All rights reserved to Sonnino David

All rights reserved to Sonnino David

not have superior technology, which makes it difficult to believe that they were able to travel the vast distances of space and reach Earth.

Although there is no need to deny the knowledge that despite everything, there may be life in space and there may be developed worlds even in the Milky Way. Thus, the problematic nature of the alien visit lies mainly in the initial technological level that they supposedly taught humans.

In other words, technologically advanced beings who could travel vast distances in space would not have bothered to give humans only basic technology. Technology that would have taken a long time to reach our technological achievements today.

Hence, if those aliens taught humans, they could have already passed on highly advanced technology to them. The failure to find such technology in archaeological finds shows that such a visit could not have taken place. This is because there is no point in letting humans go through the entire long path to reach advanced technology.

In any case, when it comes to the fourth concept, we must see the influence of a race of humans, certainly human, with advanced technology on ancient man. This teaching of technology is what ultimately leads to the agricultural revolution.

In order to teach technology, that race of teachers had to teach ancient man a language. In light of our assessment, this is a common

© All rights reserved to Sonnino David

All rights reserved to Sonnino David

language that the advanced race had to teach ancient man in order to transfer technology.

We can conclude this because we have established the basic premise that it is impossible for early man to self-discover complex processes. Even for modern man, with all his accumulated knowledge, he cannot make "real" cheese or wine without external guidance. Biological processes such as fermentation are not intuitive, and substances such as yeast or acid require knowledge and guidance. Likewise, domestication of animals, especially herbivores, due to calorie requirements, resource availability, and competition with predators, is impossible to raise without a surplus of food created only with agriculture.

Hence, early man could not have achieved the production of cheese, wine, wheat, or domestication of animals solely from internal logic or trial and error. Every complex "leap" of knowledge and culture requires an external factor that provides guidance or knowledge. And ancient language is the main tool for transmitting this knowledge. Ancient domestication of animals before agriculture is logistically and biologically unrealistic. Hence, agriculture is the key to the food surplus that enabled domestication and the accompanying cultural leap.

All rights reserved to Sonnino David

© All rights reserved to Sonnino David

That is, the development of complex technologies and skills in early man, such as processed food production, agriculture, and storage methods, cannot be explained on the basis of trial and error or logical reasoning alone.

The practical and cognitive information that led to this leap indicates the presence of external guidance or an existing knowledge system, which was transmitted through language and technological tools. Thus, the transition from pre-cultural man to early technological man requires recognition of a combination of external guidance, developed language, and practical application, and cannot be attributed to logic or intuition alone.

The division of labor presents the first chapter, which regulates the methodology. The second chapter presents all three existing methods for explaining the "Great Leap Forward." The next chapter presents the weaknesses of the existing concepts. The chapter after it presents the fourth approach. The purpose of the fifth chapter is to explain how language is everything that was invented. Without language, there is no technology.

Thus, the goal of the work, to show the existential power of language, was significantly achieved from the course of the above work. In the meantime, the proof grows that Hebrew is an ancient and not

All rights reserved to Sonnino David

© All rights reserved to Sonnino David

arbitrary language, which ends all modern linguistics and classifies it as anti-Semitic.

From this work and others, it emerges without any doubt that Hebrew is not an arbitrary language and that there is a built-in code within Hebrew. Hebrew should be seen, not through the prism of the grammar imposed on it from Arabic, but as an ancient language that is anchored in a given logical structure.

For the sake of clarity, this is only about the Hebrew of the Torah. Not even the Hebrew of the prophets and the writings, where there is already the influence of other languages, Ionian, Persian, Babylonian and Aramaic. Not to mention the Mishnah mixed with foreign languages. Also, we are not talking about the Hebrew of the diaspora literature, such as the Talmud and other rabbinical books. Certainly not modern Hebrew, which is influenced by the artificial grammar that was imposed on Hebrew.

Hence, the Hebrew of the Torah as an independent object of study, should not be compared to Arabic or modern grammar. The Hebrew of the Torah has its own internal code. There is also a distinction between “pure” Hebrew and external influences. The books of the prophets and the writings, for example, are already influenced by foreign languages, and therefore there is no room to generalize the linguistic methods that exist on them.

All rights reserved to Sonnino David

© All rights reserved to Sonnino David

In fact, it defines clear boundaries for research and helps the reader not to fall into the trap of evaluating according to external paradigms. It also justifies all the evidence and criticism of this work on modern linguistics. Since this work offers an internal, logical and functional perspective.

If we want to be more precise, we can emphasize that the key to understanding is the internal logical code of the Torah. It is what distinguishes the approach of this work from any attempt to compare or explain according to the grammar of other languages. It eliminates the external and forced framework of modern grammar.

This allows us to see Biblical Hebrew as an independent logical system, with clear internal laws. While establishing the concept that language is not arbitrary, but is a structured code that produces natural meaning.

Since Hebrew grammar, built in accordance with Arabic grammar, and based on the Mishnah, is suitable for the Mishnah and the modern Hebrew derived from it. But it cannot be imposed on the Torah.

That is, traditional Hebrew grammar was born from the spoken language and from the Mishnah, it is adapted to the structures and forms of this historical language, but it does not require biblical Hebrew.

All rights reserved to Sonnino David

© All rights reserved to Sonnino David

Therefore, in order to understand the Torah, one must take modern grammar outside and observe the language in its internal structure, according to its own rules and logic.

This move may free the Bible from the religious-ritual framework and present it as an independent moral-value system. When this system is based on the internal logic of language. It does not change religion, does not depend on rabbinical interpretation, but defines the Torah as a universal code for human behavior, with principles that can be applied even outside the Jewish framework.

This approach also makes the criticism of traditional and rabbinical linguistics sharper. It shows that language itself, not the interpreters, is the one that contains the tools for moral understanding.

Otherwise, all interpretation would be something contrary to a public law of logic on external theories and positions. This without considering agenda, sensitivities or conventions. Every sentence, repetition or syntactic complexity serves only the presentation of the tool whose purpose is to present the result. To show how ridiculous or bankrupt academic theory can be when examined through the criterion of logic.

This work presents a better method for drawing conclusions from data alone. This is done only using advanced statistical tools. All of this emphasizes that the reader or external pressure is not part of the

© All rights reserved to Sonnino David

All rights reserved to Sonnino David

equation. This solidifies the "principle of independence" of the data system, and assumes a rigid framework from which to work.

This work combines statistics, archaeology, genetics, and even interpretation of different historical perceptions. There is no attempt to "please the reader". Everything that is presented is part of the perception, and one can see the internal coherence that this work seeks, the logic that works within the system that this work posits.

The central logical narrative suggests the following variables: First, science does not "work" in isolation from society, the order in which theories appear affects their validity. The domestication of wheat does not fully correspond to the classical narrative of evolution. Hence, early man is unlikely to have carried out "conscious domestication" as evolution requires. All evolutionary models depend on human intent, and are therefore not a purely natural process. The alternatives, intelligent design or aliens, better explain the "Great Leap Forward," although direct evidence is lacking.

It should be noted that the work attempts to establish a clear and distinct connection between Popper, Karimo, and the claim to pseudoscience. This is based on hypotheses about languages, mythology, ancient technology, and botanical mutations.

In addition, the engagement with linguistic and biblical claims, while analyzing the meaning of the letters and phonological letters,

All rights reserved to Sonnino David

© All rights reserved to Sonnino David

presents many insights. The use of statistics on 130 words is a positive step, but it should be emphasized that the small sample is the result of technical constraints. Furthermore, let us assume that it is necessary to compare two languages, one with a large vocabulary and the other with a smaller vocabulary. For the purpose of comparison, the words of the language with the small vocabulary are presented.

Therefore, any sample taken will include only the small number of words, and will not refer to the large vocabulary of the more extensive language.

For example, with regard to Sumerian, it is possible to reach close to 100 unique words from the archaeological texts. But beyond that, most of the words are technical nouns or city names, rare verbs, grammatical symbols, and so on. In other words, the list will be a kind of “basic dictionary” of Sumerian.

In contrast, for Akkadian, here we can come up with a much larger number, because we have thousands of clay tablets with texts, dictionaries, and a rich academic literature. If we talk about unique words that appear in preserved texts, we can easily reach several hundred to thousands of words.

Thus, if we want to compare Akkadian with Sumerian, we will only present about 100 Sumerian words, even though Akkadian is a more

© All rights reserved to Sonnino David

All rights reserved to Sonnino David

extensive language, especially if we count all the nouns, verbs, names of gods, names of cities, and so on. This is an objective limitation of the sample that cannot be resolved.

Hence, from a methodological point of view, there is no room for complaint about a “small sample size” when it comes to Sumerian, this is the only sample that can be used, because any other language that has many more words cannot increase the comparison beyond what exists in Sumerian.

In fact, any argument against this sample ignores the simple mathematical principle that comparisons between groups are always limited by the smallest group. There is no other option here, it is not a matter of “lack of representativeness” but simply a natural limit of the data.

This problem also answers the choice of words because there is no choice but to use all the words in the small language and therefore the other languages are arranged accordingly. Words are not chosen according to taste or convenience, but simply use everything that is in the small language. All other languages are arranged accordingly, even if they do not have such a limitation, they only adapt themselves to the limitations of the small group.

Once we have removed the claims about “too small a sample” or “not representative”, only the existing variable remains, the data itself.

© All rights reserved to Sonnino David

All rights reserved to Sonnino David

Any analysis must rely on what is actually there, and use recognized statistical indicators to examine the variables. When it comes to objective data, that is, variables with limited and clear domains, this approach is the most accurate and logical.

Hence, the results and the analysis are completely correct, logical and inferable. This is because within the limits of the existing data and the statistical indicators we used, the conclusions are completely valid. There is no logical or statistical problem here in drawing conclusions from the sample. Logic is maintained, and the analysis is carried out based on all available information.

There is no room for subjective interpretations here. All we have done is an objective statistical analysis on a sample that represents everything that could be measured under the existing conditions. Every conclusion follows directly from the data, without external assumptions or personal hypotheses.

The sample presented and its statistical analysis lead exactly to the conclusion in accordance with the one hypothesis, while rejecting the null hypothesis. There is no logical gap here or reason to doubt the validity of the conclusion. It is a direct derivative of the data and the objective methodology chosen.

Hence, the main conclusions from this work are, the small sample size is not problematic, it is inevitable under the given conditions. The

© All rights reserved to Sonnino David

All rights reserved to Sonnino David

choice of words is objective, – there is no room for eliminating or choosing words, all words in the smallest language are taken. The statistical analysis is completely valid, the conclusions are based on the data and not on subjective interpretation. The methodology is consistent from the first methodology chapter, through analyses and coverages are carried out on the same objective basis. The results are unequivocal. The data supports exactly what this work sought to prove, and the entire work is based on a logical and scientific basis.

Regarding the importance of choosing Sumerian as a base language, it stems from the historical fact that

Sumerian is the oldest and only language known to be unassociated with any other language group. Therefore, using Sumerian as a base is not only practical but also theoretical: it serves as a neutral point of reference for comparing words and roots. This avoids problems of "influential language bias". Instead of comparing each language against another with a small sample, the entire comparison relies on one stable point.

Thus, if new words are discovered in the small languages in the future, the sample will be automatically updated, but the principle remains the same, comparison is always limited to the minimum sample. This will ensure that the methodology remains relevant, even as the information grows.

All rights reserved to Sonnino David

© All rights reserved to Sonnino David

From this it can be assumed that such an approach allows mapping and comparing the development of complex traits even in situations where data are limited, which is useful precisely in early agricultural evolution. That is, using all available data consistently, without introducing subjective interpretations. Apply statistics to the entire sample and not rely on specific parts or outliers. Draw conclusions from the data itself, not from prior assumptions.

This will allow, after understanding and accepting the data, researchers should develop new or updated models, which are based on the objective sample and its analysis. These models will be more robust, reduce personal biases, and allow for reliable predictions and comparisons between languages or between cultures.

In fact, this work shows researchers an operational and practical way to deal with linguistic comparisons and cultural reality. It allows to identify complex relationships between different languages, even when there seems to be no immediate connection, historical and phonetic traces allow to discover the development of words.

Helps to understand that a comparison must be based on the smallest possible sample, this forces objective research instead of trying to force illogical comparisons. Therefore, existing data should be fully exploited. Instead of complaining about lack of information or sample limitations, researchers can draw conclusions from existing data.

All rights reserved to Sonnino David

© All rights reserved to Sonnino David

There is a significant need to improve existing theories without distorting the book. The book provides a basis for refining and re-explaining the relationships between language and culture, rather than creating new theories at the expense of the data. To identify cultural and historical influences that are not obvious. For example, “avocado = lawyer” shows how words preserve traces of cultural transition that are beyond the ordinary gaze. In short, the book presses researchers to be objective, to use all available data, and to revise their theories rather than clinging to existing conventions.

The goal is to burden researchers with the responsibility to use existing data, to understand their limits and possibilities, and to revise existing theories without being tempted to create an “intellectual shortcut” or a convenient compromise. This is precisely what makes the book a practical tool; it does not teach what to think, but how to think correctly in the face of data.

This book helps researchers by forcing them to deal with the data themselves and think within the precise framework of the question or problem, without being tempted by convenient completions, external interpretations, or “stories” that explain the data in a convenient way.

All rights reserved to Sonnino David

© All rights reserved to Sonnino David

Selected bibliography

Ken-Ichi Tanno 1 , George Willcox , How fast was wild wheat domesticated? , https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/16574859/

Kent Hovind, CSS Part 7 Questions & Answers (1080p Digitally Remastered),https://archive.org/details/questions-and-answers-1080p_202312

"Jewish Nobel laureates" בוויקיפדיה: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_Jewish_Nobel_laureates

Domestication of wheat, https://smnh.tau.ac.il/en/599-2/?utm_source=chatgpt.com

Erin Blakemore, What was the Neolithic Revolution?, https://www.nationalgeographic.com/culture/article/neolithic-agricultural-revolution?utm_source=chatgpt.com

Eupedia Home > History > Timeline of agricultural domestication Where and when were various plants and animals domesticated? , https://www.eupedia.com/history/timeline_of_plant_and_animal_domestication.shtml?utm_source=chatgpt.com

Historical Archaeology & Anthropological Sciences, https://medcraveonline.com/JHAAS/JHAAS-01-00013.php?utm_source=chatgpt.com

All rights reserved to Sonnino David

© All rights reserved to Sonnino David

How agriculture and domestication began, https://www.britannica.com/topic/agriculture/How-agriculture-and-domestication-began?utm_source=chatgpt.com
How humans transformed wild wheat into its modern counterpart,https://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2017/07/170706143115.htm?utm_source=chatgpt.com
https://cdn.tovp.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/07/Drutakarma-Forbidden-Archeology-A-Three-Body-Interaction-Among-Science-Hinduism-and-Christianity.pdf?utm_source=chatgpt.com
https://www.google.co.il/books/edition/The_Protestant_Ethic_and_the_Spirit_of_C/vvZgDwAAQBAJ?hl=iw&gbpv=1&dq=The+Protestant+Ethic+and+the+Spirit+of+Capitalism&printsec=frontcover
https://www.mcremo.com/academic4.html?utm_source=chatgpt.com
John Davidson, Forbidden Archeology: The Hidden History of the Human Race,https://www.iskconcommunications.org/iskcon-journal/vol-2/forbidden-archeology-the-hidden-history-of-the-human-race?utm_source=chatgpt.com
Junhua H. Peng, Dongfa Sun, Eviatar Nevo, Domestication evolution, genetics and genomics in wheat,

All rights reserved to Sonnino David

© All rights reserved to Sonnino David

https://cris.haifa.ac.il/en/publications/domestication-evolution-genetics-and-genomics-in-wheat/?utm_source=chatgpt.com

Jürgen Renn, 2 Learning from Kushim About the Origins of Writing and Farming , https://www.mprl-series.mpg.de/proceedings/11/2/index.html?utm_source=chatgpt.com

Kent Hovind: 100 Reasons Why Evolution Is STUPID!https://www.reddit.com/r/Creation/comments/8593xq/kent_hovind_100_reasons_why_evolution_is_stupid/

Lynn, Richard, and Tatu Vanhanen. IQ and the Wealth of Nations. Westport, CT: Praeger, 2002.

Michael Cremo. Forbidden Archaeology: The Hidden History of the Human Race Retrieved 17 Octobe2013.

Plant Domestication, https://www.thoughtco.com/plant-domestication-table-dates-places-170638?utm_source=chatgpt.com

Plant Sciences and Genetics in Agriculture, https://plantscience.agri.huji.ac.il/publications/plant-domestication-neolithic-near-east-humans-plants-liaison?utm_source=chatgpt.com

Shahal Abbo, Avi Gopher, Plant domestication in the Neolithic Near East: The humans-plants liaison, https://cris.tau.ac.il/en/publications/plant-domestication-in-the-neolithic-near-east-the-humans-plants-/?utm_source=chatgpt.com

© All rights reserved to Sonnino David

Tom Morrow, Review: Forbidden Archaeology's Impact, https://ncse.ngo/review-forbidden-archaeologys-impact?utm_source=chatgpt.com

Twain, Mark. Concerning the Jews. Harper’s Magazine, Vol. 99, No. 592, Sept. 1899, pp. 527–535. Available at: https://www.gutenberg.org/ebooks/32508

Irena Botvinik and Galit Adam, Introduction to Theoretical Linguistics Part I, Open University Press, https://kotar.cet.ac.il/KotarApp/Viewer.aspx?nBookID=102588217#3.1772.6.default

The official Nobel Prize - the official website of the Nobel Prize Foundation: https://www.nobelprize.org

https://www.etzion.org.il/he/philosophy/issues-jewish-thought/rabbinic-thought/mishnat-harambam-1

Karl Popper's Criterion of Refusability, from https://textologia.net/?p=832

Chariots of the Gods 1968, published in Hebrew in 1971, published by "Bezalel Charikover", translated by Amashi Levin.

Gods from Outer Space (1970), was published in Hebrew in 1972, published by Bezalel Charikover, translated by Amashi Levin.

All rights reserved to Sonnino David

© All rights reserved to Sonnino David

The Alien Bible (Part I), from Eyal the Reader, https://www.haayal.co.il/story?id=887&NewOnly=2&LastView=2011-08-25%2009:45:45

Zvi Julian Rubin, Zachariah SitchinThe Ancient Astronaut Theory, https://www.ernarubin.org/julian/ancient_astronauts.html

David Sonino, Freeing Hebrew from the Iron Tomb: A New Study on an Ancient Language, 2018, Haifa University Library, PDF, System No. 9919570278602791

David Sonino, 2025, The Letters Know: The Hidden Message in the Hebrew Language: The Secrets of Culture, Language and Symbols Embodied in the Letters and Names of the Bible, PDF Haifa University Library, System No. 9920288467202791

David Sonino, 2025, The Language Code: Discovering the Secret Meaning of Biblical Hebrew: A New Journey to an Old World of the Depth of Letters and Words, when Biblical Hebrew is revealed as a language with a semantic and phonetic code that has not been revealed to date, PDF Haifa University Library, System No. 9920288467002791

https://school.kotar.cet.ac.il/kotarapp/index/Page.aspx?nBookID=40827664&nTocEntryID=41101187&nPageID=40916653

https://danielventura.fandom.com/he/wiki

All rights reserved to Sonnino David

© All rights reserved to Sonnino David

Keller Epstein, The Problem of the Dolmens in the Light of Recent Excavations in the Golan, Palestine: Studies in the Knowledge of the Land and its Antiquities 12, 1975, pp. 1-8

Cradle of Civilization / by Shmuel Noah Kramer and editors of Time-Life books; From English: Aharon Amir; [Tel Aviv]: Maariv Library, 1980

All rights reserved to Sonnino David

© **All rights reserved to Sonnino David**